

***The 'Whitewash' Conspiracy***  
**Re: *The King James Only Controversy* by James White**

**Alan James O'Reilly**

## *Contents*

<b>Author’s Introduction.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b><i>White’s Introduction.....</i></b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Early Conspirators and Corrupters.....</i>	7
<i>Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare.....</i>	14
<i>The God-Honoured Text of the Reformation and 1611.....</i>	17
<i>The Jesuits – ‘Engineer Corps of Hell’.....</i>	20
<i>God’s Book – the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.....</i>	22
<i>Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness.....</i>	29
<i>Catholic Allies and the Oxford Movement.....</i>	32
<i>The Revision Conspiracy.....</i>	34
<i>Rome Rejoices at Revision.....</i>	39
<i>Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath.....</i>	40
<i>A Serious Warning.....</i>	43
<i>The 1611 Authorised Holy Bible – Undefeated.....</i>	44
<i>White’s Main Postulates Refuted.....</i>	45
<b><i>Chapter 1 – “King James Only”.....</i></b>	<b>48</b>
<b><i>Chapter 2 – “If It Ain’t Broke...”.....</i></b>	<b>52</b>
<b><i>Chapter 3 – “Starting at the Beginning”.....</i></b>	<b>55</b>
<b><i>Chapter 4 – “Putting It Together”.....</i></b>	<b>99</b>
<b><i>Chapter 5 – “The King James Only Camp”.....</i></b>	<b>187</b>
<b><i>Chapter 6 – “Translational Differences”.....</i></b>	<b>249</b>
<b><i>Chapter 7 – “Textual Differences”.....</i></b>	<b>297</b>
<b><i>Chapter 8 - “The Son of God, the Lord of Glory”.....</i></b>	<b>395</b>

<i>Chapter 9 – “Problems in the KJV”</i> .....	489
<i>Chapter 10 – “Questions and Answers”</i> .....	579
<i>Part Two – “The Textual Data”</i> .....	602
<i>Further Work</i> .....	688
<i>Chapter 11 – “Vindication of Our Authorized Bible Vindicated”</i> .....	689
<i>Chapter 12 – “The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles”</i> .....	728
<b>Appendix</b> .....	746
<b>Appendix References</b> .....	801
<b>References</b> .....	802

## *Author's Introduction*

### **Overview**

James White's book *The King James Only Controversy*, Bethany House Publishers, 1995, ISBN 1-55661-575-2 has been available for over a decade. It was introduced to this author as 'proof' that 'the KJV adds to the word of God.'

I have since carried out a detailed review of James White's book and this work is the result of that study. The length of the study, threefold that of White's book, would probably strike the reader first. The reason is twofold.

- I have sought to provide a specific answer to every criticism that White makes of the 1611 Authorized King James English Holy Bible, AV1611.
- I have sought to bring to bear in summary form as many resources as possible with respect to authors who have already addressed White's criticisms of the 1611 English Bible. These include works by Drs David Cloud, Thomas Holland, Peter S. Ruckman, Mrs Gail Riplinger and articles by Dr Moorman and Will Kinney.

Extracts from both their writings and web sites, where applicable, form a large part of this study. This author is most grateful for their efforts.

This work makes extensive use of the study published in 1930 by Professor Benjamin Wilkinson, entitled *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. Doug Kutilek, a modern-day bible critic and ally of James White, has carried out extensive attacks on Benjamin Wilkinson's work, which he has posted on his web site. I have devoted the last two chapters of this study to responses to Kutilek's criticisms, including his insistence that the bibles of the godly Waldenses of Northern Italy were not faithful to the Text of the AV1611. It is my conclusion that Kutilek's criticisms of both Wilkinson's work and the Waldensian bibles are unreasonable.

Returning to James White and his book, my considered opinion is that James White has condensed into one volume virtually all the criticisms of the AV1611 that fundamentalists have levelled over the decades. I am hopeful that my response will be useful as a summary reference to enable bible believers to respond satisfactorily to any and all of these criticisms.

It should be noted that one additional work that addresses James White's book came to this author's attention while this study was in progress but was not utilised. This work is entitled *Why Not The King James Bible! An Answer*, by Dr Kirk Divietro. It is mentioned because I believe that readers should be aware of its existence, if they aren't already.

### *Using the Study*

This study follows James White's criticisms of the AV1611 in turn, chapter by chapter, with extracts, where necessary, from White's book. See **Contents** for the page numbers for the beginning of each chapter that addresses the equivalent chapter in White's book. The **Contents** lists White's chapter headings in enclosed quotes for ease of reference.

Readers will note that I have repeated on several occasions throughout the study some author citations refuting White's criticisms of the 1611 English Holy Bible, partly because White repeats certain of his criticisms of the Holy Bible, see *The King James Only Controversy*, p 45-46, 194-195 and partly because these author citations are well worth reviewing in the course of the study.

The *Appendix, Table A1*, contains a list of the main passages of scripture, numbering 241 for which White compares the AV1611, for the most part unfavourably, with modern versions such as the NIV, NASV. *Table A1* contains the page numbers from White's book where each of these passages of scripture may be found. It would therefore be advantageous for anyone using this study to have access to White's book, again for ease of reference.

Page numbers for the beginning of each chapter in White's book are listed at the end of *Table A1*, again to facilitate cross-referencing. The detailed discussions in this work on any verse listed in *Table A1* can be found by searching for the complete reference, e.g. Matthew 1:25 (not Matt. 1:25).

The *Appendix* contains additional tables for comparison between the AV1611, RV, Catholic versions and modern, supposedly 'evangelical' translations; NIV, NASV, NRSV. Other tables list differences between the 1611 AV1611 and the contemporary AV1611 and the support for the AV1611 that is found in the pre-1611 bibles of Wycliffe, Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops' and earlier versions. These data are taken from Dr Mrs Ripplinger's definitive work, *In Awe of Thy Word*, available from AV Publications.

The main text of this study includes summary information in this respect, which may be found in Tables 1-9. See p 445, 485ff, 572ff, 667ff. Summary Tables 6, 9 are revealing in that they contrast the steady *convergence* of the pre-1611 bibles towards the AV1611 Text against the rapid *divergence* of the post-1611 bibles from the AV1611 for 132 passages of scripture that White disputes in the AV1611.

#### *Conclusions from the Study*

Readers should note that James White hasn't changed his stance on *The King James Only Controversy*, as readers can see from his web site, [aomin.org/kjvo.html](http://aomin.org/kjvo.html). I haven't read his answers to his critics in detail but they appear to be mainly a repetition of the contents of his book. They may merit a closer study in the future but for now, I can only deal with one controversy at a time.

I have been able to form some conclusions about James White and his work, which I have listed below. I believe that they should be kept in mind by anyone who reads White's book and who may be swayed by the opinions of some of his more prominent supporters in this country, e.g.

Malcolm Bowden of the Creation Science Movement, [home-page.ntlworld.com/malcolmbowden/KJVonly.htm](http://home-page.ntlworld.com/malcolmbowden/KJVonly.htm)

Jacob Prash of Moriel Ministries, [www.moriel.org/articles/discernment/ruckmanism/is\\_your\\_modern\\_translation\\_corrupt.htm](http://www.moriel.org/articles/discernment/ruckmanism/is_your_modern_translation_corrupt.htm)

My conclusions are as follows.

1. James White is a hireling. Although he recommends the purchase of "*multiple translations*," p 7 of his book, he has a vested financial interest in persuading bible readers to buy the NASV, New American Standard Version, because he is (or was in the 1990s) a consultant to the NASV committee and "*has a financial relationship with the Lockman Foundation*."

See [www.exorthodoxforchrist.com/riplinger.htm](http://www.exorthodoxforchrist.com/riplinger.htm). It is therefore easy to see why James White does not want bible readers to be 'KJV-Only.'

2. James White is not missionary minded. Whatever he may profess to the contrary, James White is not mindful of the mission field. Certainly his book displays little or no such concern for distributing the scriptures world-wide. He betrays his lack of concern in his statement above with respect to the purchase of “*multiple translations.*” Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, whom White attacks repeatedly in his book, exposes White’s inward-looking attitude for what it is in her book, *Which Bible is God’s Word?*, p 92-3 1<sup>st</sup> Edition, p 116 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.

*“It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s latest work, *In Awe of Thy Word*, which runs into nearly 1200 pages, demonstrates how particularly well-suited the AV1611 is for transmission into foreign languages and how it has long been esteemed by missionaries for that reason. All modern versions fall short of the AV1611 in this respect.

James White revels somewhat on his web site, [www.bible.org/page.php?page\\_id=664](http://www.bible.org/page.php?page_id=664), in Dr Mrs Riplinger’s designation of him as “*a rude, crude heretic.*” But she didn’t start out that way in her view of him, being altogether compassionate, [www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit5.html](http://www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit5.html).

So if James White eventually acquired that designation from a gracious Christian lady like Sister Riplinger, he earned it.

3. James White is his own final authority. Nowhere in his book does James White specify what is the word of God, consisting of the words of God, and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, between two covers and where the members of the Body of Christ can find it. It is abundantly clear from his book that he doesn’t believe the AV1611 to be such. However, he betrays his own self-made approach to final authority in such statements as these, my underlinings.

P 95. “*The NIV’s rendering of the term “flesh” in Paul’s epistles as “sinful nature”...is a bit too interpretive for my tastes.*”

P.160-1. “*Scripture [a selection of modern versions and excluding the AV1611] records Jesus’ call to take up the cross in three places, and this is sufficient.*”\*

\*One wonders if White has informed the Godhead of his conclusion in this respect and advised Them of the necessary amendments to the word that “*is settled in heaven*” Psalm 119:89. Hopefully not, because, as it happens, White is wrong. Only Mark 10:21 as it stands unequivocally\* in the AV1611 has the expression “*take up the cross.*” The other three verses, Matthew 16:24, Mark 8:34, Luke 9:23 all refer to “*his cross*” not “*the cross.*” There is a distinct difference.

\*On this occasion, the NKJV, which reads as the AV1611 in Mark 10:21, appears to have overlooked the usual footnote that would eliminate the expression, in accordance with the Nestle Aland-United Bible Societies text underlying the NASV, NIV etc.

4. James White is economical with the truth. James White repeatedly accuses ‘KJV-Onlyists’ of being “*inconsistent*” p 60, 71, 72, 88, 209, 230, 231, 233, 248, 249 and of adopting “*double standards*” p 107, 162, 170, 173, 232, 236, 244. At the very least, this is a case of ‘pots and kettles.’

For example, James White insists, p 38, that the AV1611 has added to the word of God by means of the phrase “*and the Lord Jesus Christ*” at the end of Colossians 1:2, even though the phrase has overwhelming attestation from a vast and varied body of sources, including Codex Aleph or Sinaiticus. See Moorman, *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!*, p 131. The phrase is in fact, one of the ‘least disputable’ of all the so-called ‘disputed passages.’

Yet White also describes Codex Aleph as “*a great treasure*,” p 33 - in spite of supposedly adding to the word of God in Colossians 1:2. What he neglects to tell the reader is the manner in which Aleph definitely *does* add to the word of God, by means of the New Testament apocryphal books, *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Epistle of Barnabus*.

Gail Riplinger reveals in her book *New Age Versions*, p 557ff, that these two books urge the reader to “*take the name of the beast, give up to the beast and form a one-world government*,” along with other Satanic exhortations.

James White neglected to mention any of this in his book but such is the nature of his “*great treasure*” Codex Aleph. He is clearly being “*inconsistent*” and applying a “*double standard*.”

(And it is therefore easy to see why White and his allies despise Gail Riplinger and her work in equal measure.)

5. James White leans heavily towards Rome and Watchtower. In spite of what James White would undoubtedly profess to the contrary, the departures from the AV1611 that White favours and which occur mostly in the NASV, NIV, also occur to a considerable extent in Catholic and Jehovah’s Witnesses’ bibles.

White levels criticisms at 241 passages of scripture as they stand in the AV1611, 252 verses in total, of which 24 verses are from the Old Testament. Of that selection, the NIV stands with the AV1611 in only 9 of the 241 passages, or in 4% of the total. However, it lines up *against* the AV1611 *with* the JR, DR, JB and NWT\* in 28% of the passages, with the JB and NWT in 70% of the passages and with one or more of the JR, DR, JB, NWT in 89% of the passages that White mentions.

\*DR - Douay-Rheims, Challoner’s 1749 Revision, JR - Jesuit Rheims 1582 New Testament, from the web, [www.studylight.org/desk/](http://www.studylight.org/desk/) and probably a reproduction of the DR - it doesn’t differ, JB - Jerusalem Bible, NWT - New World Translation

James White won’t see himself as a Vatican-Watchtower slave but he is. Note also that in these last days of “*perilous times*” 2 Timothy 3:1, the modern so-called ‘evangelical’ versions are drifting further from the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible than even the known apostate versions. See Table 9 in the Review that follows. The time of faith being “*made shipwreck*” cannot be long delayed, 1 Timothy 1:20.

6. James White has played down evidence, e.g. that of Rev J. A. Moorman – see above, that conflicts with or refutes White’s notion of what is or is not scripture, e.g. with respect to John 7:53-8:11.

7. James White has tried to excuse omission of important words and phrases such as **“of the Lord Jesus Christ”** e.g. in Ephesians 3:14, because similar wording is found elsewhere in the New Testament, thereby condoning the gradual weakening of major biblical doctrines. See point 3 above.
8. James White has repeatedly indulged in unsubstantiated speculation about what is or is not, or may or may not be scripture, in his opinion, e.g. with respect to Matthew 6:13, John 3:13, 1 Corinthians 11:24.
9. James White has readily resorted to subjective interpretation in order to evade textual evidence unfavourable to his opinion about what is or is not or may or may not be scripture, e.g. with respect to Mark 16:9-20, Philippians 4:13.
10. James White has ignored the works of genuine textual scholars such as Dr Hills and Dean Burgon, because their conclusions based on exceptionally thorough, indeed exhaustive studies of textual evidence disagreed with his own opinion about what is or is not scripture, even though White had access to their works and even listed some of them in his bibliography.

In sum, I do not regard either James White or his work as trustworthy with respect **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21. Neither do I trust any of his fellow travellers like Doug Kutilek, Malcolm Bowden\* and Jacob Prasch in this respect.

\*The above statement applies only to Malcolm Bowden’s endorsement of James White, **“all flesh is as grass”** 1 Peter 1:24. Malcolm Bowden is otherwise a staunch Biblical creationist whose detailed book *True Science Agrees With The Bible* ISBN 0 9506042 4 0 and free copyright-free CD *Evidence against Evolution and for the Bible* cannot be too highly recommended – Alan O’Reilly, June 2012.

Readers are left to draw their own conclusions.

Alan O’Reilly  
June 2008



## ***The 'Whitewash' Conspiracy – re: The King James Only Controversy by James White***

### **Summary**

This book by James White, of Alpha and Omega Ministries, Phoenix, Arizona, attempts to show that believing the Authorised 1611 King James Bible to be the pure words of God and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, is wrong, because:

- There is no 'conspiracy' behind the modern versions against the AV1611
- The Greek texts underlying the modern translations have not been corrupted
- Modern scholarship that compiled these texts is entirely trustworthy
- The AV1611 is the result of human effort and contains errors
- The modern translations often yield superior readings to the AV1611
- The modern translations do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This review will show that White is wrong in all six of the above respects and that his book is an exercise in dissimulation from start to finish. Summary answers to White's essential postulates are as follows:

### ***No Conspiracy?***

John Burgon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament, pin-pointed the satanic conspiracy against the holy scriptures as follows:

*“Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel...Corrupting influences...were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine.”*

### ***Uncorrupted Greek Texts?***

Of the early Greek manuscripts that underlie the departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version, Burgon, who collated them, said this:

*“The five Old Uncials' (Aleph A B C D) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text...and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of an article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence.”*

### ***Modern Scholarship Trustworthy?***

The departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version were orchestrated mainly by Cambridge academics Westcott and Hort. Of their 'scholarship,' Burgon stated:

*“My contention is, - NOT that the Theory of Drs Westcott and Hort rests on an INSECURE foundation, but, that it rests on NO FOUNDATION AT ALL.”*

### ***A Modern Scholar Speaks***

Of White's remaining postulates, this is the verdict of Dr Frank Logsdon, principal scholar behind the NASV, New American Standard Version, match mate to the NIV:

*“I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard...you can say the Authorized Version is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct!”*

Amen!

## Introduction

The book *The King James Only Controversy* by James White, of Alpha and Omega Ministries, Phoenix, Arizona, attempts to show that anyone who believes the Authorised 1611 King James Bible to be the pure words of God and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, is mistaken, on the grounds that:

- There is no ‘conspiracy’ behind the modern versions against the AV1611
- The Greek texts underlying the modern translations have not been corrupted
- Modern scholarship that compiled these texts is entirely trustworthy
- The AV1611 is the result of human effort and contains errors
- The modern translations often yield superior readings to the AV1611
- The modern translations do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This review will show that White is wrong in all six of the above respects and that his book is an exercise in dissimulation from start to finish.

In 1996, a year after White’s book appeared, Dr Peter S. Ruckman of the Pensacola Bible Institute in Florida, published a nearly five-hundred page refutation of *The King James Only Controversy* that James White has never answered<sup>1</sup>. About the time of his book’s publication, James White challenged Dr Ruckman to a debate claiming he could find seven errors in the Authorised Version.

As the one challenged, Dr Ruckman sent White notification of the time and place of the debate and a copy of a Gideon’s AV1611 Bible from which he stipulated that White prove the seven errors that he alleged<sup>2</sup>.

White reneged on the debate and has never issued Dr Ruckman with a fresh challenge. The BBB printed White’s seven alleged errors and Dr Ruckman discussed them in detail. They are Luke 2:22, Acts 5:30, Hebrews 10:23, Jeremiah 34:16, Revelation 16:5, Acts 19:37 and 1 John 5:7. This work will address these verses either where White cites them first, e.g. in Chapter 4, with respect to Jeremiah 34:16, Luke 2:22, Revelation 16:5, 1 John 5:7 or in Chapter 5, where he attacks Dr Ruckman. Other shortcomings that White alleges the AV1611 contains, in response to his six postulates above will also be discussed subsequently but White’s unwillingness to follow through on his challenge to Dr Ruckman does call into question his ability to substantiate the bold assertion he makes that the AV1611 is “*a great, yet imperfect translation of the Bible.*”<sup>3 p vii</sup>

The above statement raises yet another question. What, according to White, is ‘the Bible?’ Nowhere in two hundred and seventy-one pages does White identify any single volume between two covers as ‘the Bible.’ White regards even the modern bibles as merely translations. And yet he asserts that “*We must be clear on why we believe the Bible to be God’s Word,*”<sup>3 p vi</sup> stressing the importance of “*the Bible... God’s word [requiring] us to be students of that book,*” “*the entirety of the Bible,*” “*the highest standard of truth,*” “*to be men and women of truth and honesty,*” “*Scripture... God’s revealed truth,*” “*Christians are to be lovers of truth,*” “*A true Christian scholar is a lover of truth*”<sup>3 p vi, vii, viii, 13, 95, 217, 247</sup>

But nowhere in his book does he specify what “*God’s Word*” is, in a form that is accessible today, though he mentions various versions, Greek editions and manuscript sources. This is surely a point of contention with respect to *The King James Only Controversy*.

Yet White insists that it is the KJV Only advocates – anyone who believes that the Authorised Version *is* the Bible and God’s pure word – who cause disruption and conten-

tion in the local church and are responsible for the destruction of many churches, though none that White can actually identify<sup>3 p iv-v</sup>.

Nevertheless, bible believers should be concerned over the seriousness of these charges, together with White's main postulates above and prepared to answer them. Thoroughgoing responses already exist<sup>4, 5, 6, 7</sup> in this respect, in addition to Dr Ruckman's detailed work but nothing will be lost by additional study, drawing as appropriate on these earlier analyses, for as Solomon said:

***“Where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counsellors there is safety”*** Proverbs 11:14.

For simplicity, this review will follow the chapters of White's book in sequence, highlighting his main postulates as appropriate and dealing with his criticisms of the Holy Bible as they arise.

Where White has criticised particular passages of scripture as found in the AV1611 with respect to other alternatives, these are listed in the **Appendix**, together with the equivalent renderings of the NIV, a translation that White evidently favours over the AV1611 (most of the time) and those of certain translations that as a self-professed “*biblical conservative*” White would most likely *not* recommend\*<sup>3 p vii</sup>. These are the JB, the Jerusalem Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, Challoner's Revision, 1749-52 of the Roman Catholic DR, Douay-Rheims Version, the JR, Jesuit Rheims 1582 New Testament\*\* and the NWT, the New World Translation of the Watchtower heresy.

\*Of necessity an inference, in that White fails to define a “*biblical conservative*”. However, he insists that – with the help various translations - he has<sup>3 p 131</sup> “*written entire books defending salvation by grace through faith alone.*” This statement indicates that White would not support bibles compiled by groups that deny this doctrine.

\*\*As available from the internet, [www.hti.umich.edu/r/rheims/browse.html](http://www.hti.umich.edu/r/rheims/browse.html)

An interesting result emerges from the comparison.

White levels criticisms at 241 passages of scripture as they stand in the AV1611, 252 verses in total, of which 24 verses are from the Old Testament. Of that selection, the NIV stands with the AV1611 in only 9 of the 241 passages, or in 4% of the total. However, it lines up *against* the AV1611 *with* the JR, DR, JB and NWT in 28% of the passages, with the JB and NWT in 70% of the passages and with one or more of the JR, DR, JB, NWT in 89% of the passages that White mentions.

So according to White and regardless of his profession of “*defending salvation by grace through faith alone,*” given that he supports the modern renderings of these passages, at least seven times out of ten where ‘disputed’ passages arise, God gave His words to Rome and Watchtower but not to faithful bible believers who took the AV1611 “*unto the uttermost part of the earth*” Acts 1:8.

It is interesting to see what company a latter-day “*biblical conservative*” is prepared to keep but the Authorised Version does tend to unite former foes in ecumenical oneness, just as its Author did.

***“And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves”*** Luke 23:12.

Unlike James White, this reviewer not only has ‘the Bible’ but possesses the Book in its ‘entirety’ and is aware of the testimony of centuries of jurisprudence in the English-

speaking nations to the effect that the Authorised Holy Bible is indeed ‘the highest standard of truth.’

James White has not produced any that is higher.

This review will therefore not hesitate to cite the Authorised Holy Bible as appropriate in its own vindication. This is not “*circular reasoning*” of which White repeatedly accuses bible believers<sup>3 p vii, 85, n 34, 92, 112, 114, 126, 128, 155, 156, 167, 217, 219, 249</sup> but *scriptural* reasoning, in the light of Paul’s exhortation to the Corinthian Church:

**“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual”** 1 Corinthians 2:13.

### **White's Introduction**

White asserts that KJV bible believers cause “*disruption and contention*”. See above. He attempts to justify this assertion by allusion to Matthew 18:11, found in the AV1611 but omitted by the NIV that relegates the verse to a footnote. However, he fails to inform the reader that:

- Corrupt modern versions, the JB, NWT also omit the verse<sup>8\* p 61</sup>, in agreement with the corrupt NIV. \*now online, [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/)
- Manuscript evidence in support of the verse is overwhelming<sup>8 p 61, 9, p 68</sup>. Of the uncial or uppercase Greek manuscripts, only א (Aleph, or Sinaiticus), B (or Vaticanus), L, and three cursives unequivocally omit the verse.

White makes no attempt in his *Introduction* to resolve the discrepancy and fails to address Matthew 18:11 until page 155 of his work, where he claims, without any evidence that the verse was “*borrowed*” from Luke 19:10, even though the Lord’s statements in these passages are not identical.

**“For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost”** Matthew 18:11.

**“For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost”** Luke 19:10.

Did a careless scribe omit the words “*to seek and*”? White does not say, which begs the question, why not?

White makes reference on page 155 to several passages allegedly “*borrowed*” from one Gospel and inserted into another, in every case without a shred of evidence.

It is therefore instructive to review the comments by John Burgon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament<sup>10</sup>:

*“I am utterly disinclined to believe - as grossly improbable does it seem - that at the end of 1800 years, 995 copies out of every thousand suppose, will prove untrustworthy; and that the one, two, three, four or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have retained the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired. I am utterly unable to believe, in short, that God’s promise has so entirely failed, that at the end of 1800 years much of the text of the Gospel had in point of fact to be picked up by a German critic out of a waste-paper basket in the convent of St. Catherine\*; and that the entire text had to be remodelled after the pattern set by a couple of copies which had remained in neglect during fifteen centuries, and had probably owed their survival to that neglect; whilst hundreds of others had been thumbed to pieces, and had bequeathed their witness to copies made from them.”*

\*Codex Aleph<sup>8 p 13</sup>

White, of course, would immediately cite apparently ‘minority’ readings in the AV1611 such as 1 John 5:7 in order to overthrow Burgon’s statement above but the Dean is speaking of the Bible Text of 1800 years’ standing amongst genuine bible believers, such as the Waldenses, whom Rome repeatedly persecuted throughout their long history and this Text is the Authorised Holy Bible of 1611. Thus, Burgon’s statement is valid for the AV1611. Jack A. Moorman has dealt effectively with exceptional individual passages within the AV1611 found in only a minority of manuscripts<sup>11</sup>. Though as Moorman points out<sup>9 p 26, 11 p 8-14</sup> only 414 of the 2800+ cursive manuscripts have been extensively collated and only about 1000 examined for ‘key’ passages. The reason for the delay in collation may well be that the likely agreement of the cursive manuscripts with the AV1611 is too high for the scholars’ liking, demonstrating the great uniformity of preser-

vation the AV1611 Text has enjoyed down through the centuries, as the Dean's statement indicates. Further collation could well yield considerably greater manuscript agreement with alleged 'minority' AV1611 readings.

Yet in spite of his unsubstantiated and therefore highly contentious assertions about allegedly "*borrowed*" passages, White insists that it is bible believers who cause "*disruption and contention*". Here White is clearly being inconsistent, though he repeatedly also charges bible believers with that same offence of inconsistency<sup>3 p 60, 71, 72, 88, 209, 230, 231, 233, 248, 249</sup>.

The expression 'pots and kettles' comes to mind.

White introduces the topic of "*grand and complex conspiracies*" alleged by KJV Onlyists on page iv of his *Introduction* and devotes much of his work<sup>3 p 4, 72, 95, 99, 106, 107, 115, 130, 146, 153, 160, 162, 164, 170, 183, 204, 205, 207, 209, 213, 216, 224</sup> to disavowing any notion of a conspiracy against "*the scripture of truth*" Daniel 10:21.

Whitney's researches<sup>5</sup> reveal the shallowness of White's assertion.

*"Regarding White's belief about no one being influenced to try and corrupt the biblical text, White does not tell the reader about those in the early church who were concerned about corrupters of the Word. I will give a couple of quotes to demonstrate this.*

*"Gaius (AD175-200) speaks of the source of corruptions that survive in the early papyri:*

*"The Divine Scriptures these heretics have audaciously corrupted, laying violent hands upon them, under pretence of correcting them." Burgon, The Revision Revised, p. 323*

*[Scrivener, cited by Burgon, The Revision Revised, p 317]:*

*"The worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected originated within one hundred years after it was composed."*

*"He did not tell the reader about some contemporary scholarship's comments on early textual variations/changes.*

*"Colwell (What is the Best New Testament Text?, p.119)*

*"The first two centuries witnessed the creations of the large number of variations known to scholars today in the manuscripts of the New Testament most variations, I believe, were made deliberately." See Burgon's remarks cited in Chapter 3, on the intentional corruption of the Traditional Text by ancient heretics, which he discusses in The Revision Revised, p 336. See also Chapter 7, with respect to Burgon's analysis of "Omission...the besetting fault of transcribers" who thereby introduced even more errors into manuscripts copied from sources already corrupted by heretics.*

*"G. D. Kilpatrick (Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament, pp 125-131)*

*"Deliberate changes in all text types appear to antedate A.D. 200...as distinct from errors...all categories of deliberate alteration. are present in both groups. Tatian is the last author of make deliberate changes, the vast majority of deliberate changes were older than A.D. 200, they came into being in the period A.D. 50-200."*

Yet, even while insisting<sup>3 p v</sup> that "*The KJV Only controversy feeds upon ignorance among Christians regarding the origin, transmission, and translation of the Bible*" ("*Bible*" unspecified yet again), White is again inconsistent. He regards Dean Burgon as "*a scholar of the first rank*"<sup>3 p 91</sup>, possibly borrowing the term from Dr Otis Fuller's description of Benjamin C. Wilkinson<sup>12 p 174</sup> but White, though citing an exceptional case where Burgon rejected the AV1611 reading of Matthew 10:8<sup>8 p 136</sup>, fails to address seriously any

of the causes of corruption that Dean Burgon researched or those that Dr Mrs Gail Ripplinger highlighted or those that Benjamin Wilkinson described.

Dean Burgon states:

*“Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel. First, heretical assailants of Christianity, - then, orthodox defenders of the Truth, - lastly and above all, self-constituted Critics, who (like Dr Hort\*) imagined themselves at liberty to resort to ‘instinctive processes’ of Criticism; and who, at first as well as ‘at last,’ freely made their appeal ‘to the individual mind\*\*.’ – such were the corrupting influences which were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine. Profane literature has never known anything approaching to it, - can show nothing at all like it. Satan’s arts were defeated indeed through the Church’s faithfulness because, - (the good Providence of God had so willed it,) – the perpetual multiplication, in every quarter, of copies required for Ecclesiastical use, - not to say the solicitude of faithful men in diverse regions of ancient Christendom to retain for themselves unadulterated specimens of the inspired Text, - proved a sufficient safeguard against the grosser forms of corruption.”*<sup>13 p 334</sup>

\*Or like James White.

\*\*What White terms<sup>3 p 95</sup> “individual responsibility.”

Gail Ripplinger cites the late E. W. Colwell, whom she describes as “*the premier North American New Testament scholar*” as follows<sup>14 p 468</sup>:

*““Scholars now believe that most errors were made deliberately...the variant readings in the New Testament were created for theological or dogmatic reasons. Most of the manuals now in print (including mine!) will tell you that these variations were the fruit of careless treatment. The reverse is the case.””*

White treats Gail Ripplinger’s thoroughly researched work with contempt<sup>3 p 96ff</sup>. His misrepresentation of her efforts will be addressed subsequently but here it should be noted that White does not challenge Mrs Ripplinger’s citation of Colwell.

### ***Early Conspirators and Corrupters***

Much of what follows in this part of the work has been drawn from the researches of Dr Benjamin G. Wilkinson<sup>12 p 180ff</sup>, author of *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. Dr Wilkinson deals effectively with at least the first five of White’s main postulates.

He states that:

*“We hear a great deal today about the Sunday Law of the Roman Emperor Constantine, 321 AD. Why is it that we do not hear about the corrupt Bible which Constantine adopted and promulgated, the version which for 1800 years has been exploited by the forces of heresy and apostasy? This Bible, we regret to say, lies at the bottom of many versions which now flood the publishing houses, the schools, the churches, yes, many homes, and are bringing confusion and doubt to untold millions...”*

*“Inspired by the unerring Spirit of God, chosen men brought forth the different books of the New Testament, these originally written in Greek. For a few years, under the guidance of the noble apostles, believers in Christ were privileged to have the unadulterated Word of God.*

*“But soon the scene changed; the fury of Satan, robbed of further opportunity to harass the Son of God, turned upon the written Word. Heretical sects, warring for supremacy, corrupted the manuscripts in order to further their ends.”*

Citing church historian G. P. Fisher, Wilkinson states:

*“‘Epiphanius, in his polemic treatise the ‘Panarion,’ describes not less than eighty heretical parties.’ The Roman Catholics won. The true church fled into the wilderness, taking pure manuscripts with her.”*

Citing Acts 20:30, 31, **“Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears,”** Wilkinson continues:

*“The Holy Spirit deemed it of high importance to put on record this prophecy, to warn us that even from among the elders or bishops there would arise perverse leadership.”*

The first danger to arise from perverse leadership was the exaltation of **“science falsely so called”** 1 Timothy 6:20, above the scriptures, including philosophical science, about which Paul also warned, Colossians 2:8 and which Wilkinson bluntly declares to be **“false knowledge.”** He explains:

*“False teachers were placing their own interpretations on Christian truth by reading into it human ideas. This tendency grew and increased until a great system bearing the name Christianity, known as Gnosticism, was established.”*

This was the outcome of Paul’s warning in 2 Timothy 3:1-7, concerning the **“perilous times”** of **“the last days,”** when **“men shall be...heady, highminded...ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,”** like the NIV translators, who state in the Preface to their version, **“the work of translation is never wholly finished.”**

They missed the finish date by over 350 years. Their **“heady, highminded”** self-assertion is like that of their mentor, who boastfully declared, **“I will be like the most High”** Isaiah 14:14b.

This is the source of Gnosticism and all the modern offspring it has spawned, merely a latter-day rehash of Genesis 3:1b, **“Yea, hath God said?”**

One feature of Gnosticism, absorbed by J. H. Newman who was made a cardinal after he left the Church of England for the Church of Rome, was the notion<sup>12 p 184</sup> that **“the unseen universe was inhabited by hosts of intermediate beings who were spiritual agents between God and creation.”**

The Romish idea of intermediate ‘saints’,<sup>15 p 30ff</sup> follows directly from this feature of Gnosticism. Likewise the notion of New Age avatars, or spirit guides, which Gail Riplinger warns are ushered in by the alteration of the AV1611’s **“only begotten”** with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ in John 1:14, 18, 3:16, 18, 1 John 4:9 to **“one and only”** or similar in the NIV and other modern versions<sup>14 p 342-3</sup>.

Speaking of Gnostic influence in the Church of England and its Romanist associations at the time of the publication of the RV, Revised Version, 1881-4, forerunner of most of the modern versions, Wilkinson states:

*“A distinct class of the Romanizing portion of the Church of England belongs to this philosophical category.”*



Wilkinson then reveals that the next step in the coming apostasy was that of “*spiritualising the scriptures away.*” He cites Paul’s warning in 2 Timothy 2:16-18:

***“But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some”***

As Dr Ruckman warns<sup>16 p 225ff</sup>, these “***profane and vain babblings***” “*represent the official position of the Reformed Presbyterian Churches in Europe and America...[and] the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church and the Vatican State.*”

This false teaching is called ‘A-Millennialism.’ It erroneously relegates the first resurrection of Revelation 20:4-5, yet future, to the past as conversion and in turn the Lord’s literal millennial reign on earth, also yet future, to Christians reigning now, spiritually.

The danger of this false teaching is that the Christian will not see himself as Paul did, “***I am crucified with Christ***” Galatians 2:20, 5:24 on a daily basis, Luke 9:23 and therefore risk falling into the sinful ways of the Corinthian Church, who in the words of the Apostle Paul, “***Ye have reigned as kings without us***” 1 Corinthians 4:8. Gail Riplinger<sup>14 p 242ff</sup> effectively demonstrates how this risk is exacerbated by the inferior “*past completed*” equivalent readings of the modern versions, e.g. the NIV rendering “*I have been crucified*” i.e. ‘I have been released from the “***affections and lusts***” of the flesh.’ No, you haven’t. The correct AV1611 readings show that, by definition, “***They that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts***” Galatians 5:24 but this action is not ‘past completed’. It is present continuous, according to Galatians 2:20, as long as the believer is “***in the flesh.***”

Wilkinson states that the next danger was that of substituting philosophy for scripture, citing Paul’s warning in Colossians 2:8:

***“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”***

Citing the historian Harnack, Wilkinson continues, “*“Greek philosophy exercised the greatest influence not only on the Christian mode of thought, but also through that on the institutions of the Church. In the completed church we find again the philosophical schools.” The greatest enemies of the infant Christian church, therefore, were [found]...in the rising flood of heresy which, under the name of Christianity, engulfed the truth for many years. This is what brought on the Dark Ages. This rising flood...had multiplied in abundance copies of the Scriptures with bewildering changes in verses and passages within one hundred years after the death of John (100 A.D.). As Irenaeus said concerning Marcion, the Gnostic: “Wherefore also Marcion and his followers have betaken themselves to mutilating the Scriptures, not acknowledging some books at all; and curtailing the Gospel according to Luke, and the epistles of Paul, they assert that these alone are authentic, which they have themselves shortened.””*”

After the manner of James White, as will be seen.

The philosophical bent of the modern translators, stretching back to the Dark Ages and beyond may be discerned in the NIV rendering of Colossians 2:8:

***“See to it that no-one takes you captive through hollow and deceptive philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ.”***

That isn't what Colossians 2:8 said. It is philosophy *as such*, not "*hollow and deceptive philosophy*" that is "*vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world.*" Philosophy's founder was himself said to be "*full of wisdom*" Ezekiel 28:12 but also "*perfect in beauty*" so that "*Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness*" Ezekiel 28:17.

In turn, Satan sought to "*be like the most High.*" See Isaiah 14:14b above. He became the author of philosophy, corrupt wisdom, "*earthly, sensual, devilish*" James 3:15.

Even to the extent of corrupting the words of the most High, 2 Corinthians 2:17, according to philosophy's basic question, "*Yea, hath God said?*" Genesis 3:1b.

And persuading men so.

Commenting on Colossians 2:8<sup>17 p 522ff</sup> Dr Ruckman states:

*"Not one philosophy would defend the literal, visible Second Coming of Jesus Christ to reign on earth. Not one philosophy would teach the conscious eternal torment of a Christ-rejecter in Hell. And not one major philosophy would enable any man who ever lived to be able to win a soul to Christ."*

Commenting on the history of the preservation of scriptures and the mutilation of various copies, Wilkinson states<sup>12 p 187ff</sup>:

*"Fundamentally, there are only two streams of bibles. The vast volume of literature on this subject [shows] that down through the centuries there were only two streams of manuscripts.*

*"The first stream which carried the Received Text in Hebrew and Greek, began with the apostolic churches. [It] was protected...by the Syrian Church of Antioch which produced eminent scholarship; by the Italic Church in Northern Italy...the Gallic Church in southern France and by the Celtic Church in Great Britain; by the pre-Waldensian, the Waldensian and the churches of the Reformation.*

*"This first stream appears with very little change, in the Protestant Bibles of many languages, and in English, in that Bible known as the King James Version, the one which has been in use for three hundred years in the English-speaking world. These manuscripts have in agreement with them, by far the vast majority of copies of the original text. So vast is this majority that even the enemies of the Received Text admit that nineteen-twentieths of all Greek manuscripts are of this class...*

*"The second stream is a small one of a very few manuscripts. These last manuscripts are represented\*:*

*"(a) In Greek: - The Vatican Ms., or Codex B, in the library at Rome; and the Sinaitic, or Codex Aleph, its brother...*

*"(b) In Latin: - The Vulgate or Latin Bible of Jerome.*

*"(c) In English: - The Jesuit Bible of 1582, which later with vast changes is seen in the Douay, or Catholic Bible.*

*"(d) In English again: - In many modern Bibles which introduce practically all the Catholic readings which were rejected by the Protestants of the Reformation; among these, prominently, are the Revised Versions\*\*.*

*"So the present controversy between the King James Bible in English and the modern versions is the same old contest fought out between the early church and rival sects; and*

*later, between the Waldenses and the Papists from the fourth to the nineteenth centuries; and later still, between the Reformers and the Jesuits in the sixteenth century\*\*\*.”*

\*In the main. Bible critics will insist that Aleph and B “*are not the only exemplars*” of the Alexandrian or minority text underlying most of the modern versions but close inspection of the Alexandrian resources reveals that<sup>8 p 116ff</sup>:

- The earliest witnesses to the minority text are mainly from Egypt, whereas the manuscripts supporting the Received Text derive from a much wider geographical region; from Asia Minor, to North Africa and across Europe to the British Isles<sup>8 p 124</sup>.
- Exemplars in addition to Aleph and B are few compared to those of the Received Text<sup>8 p 130ff</sup>. They consist mainly of the Beatty Papyri, P 45, 46, the Bodmer Papyri, P66, P75 and portions of the old codices from the 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> centuries, Alexandrinus A, Ephraem Syrus C and Freer Washington W, together with Codex D (Bezae in the Gospels and Acts, Claromontanus in the Epistles). (Nearly 100 papyrus fragments exist but they agree as much with the Received Text as with the Alexandrian<sup>8 p 5, 129ff</sup>.)

\*\*The NIV New Testament repeatedly agrees with the DR, RV, JB, NWT *against* the AV1611. At least 60 typical examples may be cited<sup>8 p 258ff</sup>.

\*\*\*And now between ordinary bible believers and ‘scholarship-onlyists’ like James White.

The corrupt contents of Aleph and B may be summarised as follows<sup>8 p 13</sup>:

B omits Genesis 1:1-46:28, parts of 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Nehemiah, Psalm 105:26-137:6, Matthew 16:2,3, John 7:53-8:12, the Pauline Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews 9:14-13:25, Revelation but adds the Old Testament Apocrypha.

Aleph omits Genesis 23:19-24:46, Numbers 5:27-7:20, 1 Chronicles 9:27-19:17, Exodus, Joshua, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Judges, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:12 but adds New Testament apocryphal writings *Shepherd of Hermes* and *Epistle of Barnabus*.

Both codices alter or omit many other individual verses in the New Testament. These omissions will be considered later in more detail.

Wilkinson<sup>12 p 190ff</sup> describes the process of manuscript corruption that existed as early as the First Century AD but was blocked by the apostles while they lived.

*“The last of the apostles to pass away was John. His death is usually placed about 100 AD. In his closing days, he cooperated in the collecting and forming of those writings we call the New Testament. An ordinary reading of Acts, Chapter 15, will prove the scrupulous care with which the early church guarded her sacred writings. [Citing historian Stanley] “And so well did God’s true people through the ages agree on what was Scripture and what was not, that that no general council of the church, until that of Trent (1545) dominated by the Jesuits, dared to say anything as to what books should comprise the Bible or what texts were or were not spurious.”*

*“While John lived, heresy could make no serious headway. He had hardly passed away, however, before perverse teachers infested the Christian Church...These years were times which saw the New Testament books corrupted in abundance.*

*“Eusebius is witness to this fact. He also relates that the corrupted manuscripts were so prevalent that agreement between the copies was hopeless: and that those who were corrupting the scriptures, claimed that they were really correcting them.”*

See Whitney’s comments earlier. Wilkinson continues.

*“When the warring sects had been consolidated under the iron hand of Constantine, this heretical potentate adopted the Bible which combined the contradictory versions into one, and so blended the various corruptions with the bulk of pure teachings as to give sanction to the great apostasy now seated on the throne of power.”*

Wilkinson reveals that from the time of the death of the Apostle John, *“four names stand out in prominence whose teachings contributed both to the victorious heresy and to the final issuing of manuscripts of a corrupt New Testament.”*

These names are Justin Martyr, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen (184-254 AD), also of Alexandria. They represent successive generations of philosophical master and pupil. Tatian produced a harmony of the Gospels called the Diatessaron<sup>8 p 6-7</sup>. It often agrees with the Received Text<sup>18 p 209</sup> against the Alexandrian but Tatian’s pupil Clement and especially ‘grand’ pupil, Origen, mightily progressed the corruption.

Moreover, Origen greatly influenced Eusebius of Caesarea<sup>12 p 192, 19 p 18, 19</sup> (260-340) AD – see above – with damaging results for the scriptures in the early centuries of the Church, as Wilkinson<sup>12 p 193</sup> shows, quoting Scrivener:

*““It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Irenaeus (AD 150) and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stucia, or Erasmus, or Stephen thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus.””*

This paradox occurred because although Eusebius overtly deplored Marcion’s and Tatian’s corruption of the scriptures after John’s death, he nevertheless corrupted them far more himself by means of Origen’s philosophical ramblings and false teachings; for example that the Lord Jesus Christ was a created being who did not have eternal existence as God.

David Cloud<sup>4 Part 1</sup> says of Origen, *“Of Origen’s textual efforts, Frederick Nolan makes the following important observation: “... HE CONTRIBUTED TO WEAKEN THE AUTHORITY OF THE RECEIVED TEXT OF THE NEW [TESTAMENT]. In the course of his Commentaries, he cited the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, on the former part of the Canon, he appealed to the authority of Valentinus and Heracleon on the latter. WHILE HE THUS RAISED THE CREDIT OF THOSE REVISALS, WHICH HAD BEEN MADE BY THE HERETICKS, HE DETRACTED FROM THE AUTHORITY OF THAT TEXT WHICH HAD BEEN RECEIVED BY THE ORTHODOX. Some difficulties which he found himself unable to solve in the Evangelists, he undertook to remove, BY EXPRESSING HIS DOUBTS OF THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT. In some instances he ventured to impeach the reading of the New Testament on the testimony of the Old, and to convict the copies of one Gospel on the evidence of another: thus giving loose to his fancy, and indulging in many wild conjectures, HE CONSIDERABLY IMPAIRED THE CREDIT OF THE VULGAR OR COMMON EDITION, as well in the New as in the Old Testament” (emphasis added) (Nolan, Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, pp. 432-34).””*

Origen's blasphemy, which White pathetically attempts to defend, as will be seen, is the main reason why the Alexandrian text and in turn the modern versions repeatedly downgrade the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Ray<sup>19</sup> p 18-23 explains, in part citing Wilkinson<sup>12</sup> p 195:

*"Eusebius...edited the fifth column\* of the Hexapla which was Origen's Bible. Constantine chose this, and asked Eusebius to prepare 50 copies for him...Several textual authorities believe that the Sinaitic and Vaticanus manuscripts are two extant copies of the 50 Greek manuscripts copied for Constantine by Eusebius in 331 AD. In the minds of those who are well informed; the Latin Vulgate; the Vaticanus; the Sinaiticus; the Hexapla; Jerome; Eusebius; and Origen; are terms which are inseparable.*

*"According to authorities the date of [Vaticanus's] writing is placed within the years of 325 to 350 AD. This date fits in with the conviction of those who claim that it is the product of Eusebius who was ordered by Emperor Constantine to make 50 copies of the scriptures in 331.*

*"For the most part [the Sinaiticus] is in agreement with the Vaticanus\*\*; therefore, from all indications it could have been written by Eusebius.*

*"Jerome wrote his Latin Vulgate in 382 AD and the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were written around 331...[and] Jerome's Vulgate is largely in agreement with these two manuscripts. There were plenty of Jerome's Latin Vulgates available in 1611. In the fourth century, Helvidius, a great scholar of northern Italy, accused Jerome of using corrupt Greek manuscripts. With these thoughts in mind, the arguments about these two old manuscripts the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, not being available for the translators in 1611 seems very weak. Other manuscripts like them were not considered canonical and were discarded by the scholars who gave us the King James Bible."*

\*The expression has passed into common usage, rightly denoting treachery.

\*\*With respect to departures from the Received Text. Burgon has revealed the glaring internal inconsistencies between Aleph and B, which will be addressed later. Although united in rejecting established readings of the Received Text, Eusebius's scribes appear to have exercised considerable latitude otherwise in the compilation of Constantine's copies.

Ray illustrates the untrustworthiness of the manuscripts underlying the modern versions with reference to John 9:38 and Acts 8:37. He alludes to Origen's and Eusebius's "*Arianism, the un-deifying of Christ,*" as influencing a footnote in the ASV, American Standard Version, of 1901, indicating that worship pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ should be interpreted merely as reverence. Origen's Arian philosophy is encountered in the NIV in Matthew 9:18, 20:20, Mark 5:6 in agreement with the JB, NWT<sup>8</sup> p 56, even though the NIV has "*he worshipped him*" in John 9:38.

Perhaps as they 'improve' their "*never wholly finished version,*" the NIV translators will alter "*worshipped*" in John 9:38 as well. Their alteration of "**God**" to "*Man*" in verse 35 and "**Lord**" to "*Sir*" in verse 36 indicates there are moving that way.

Of Origen's Arian assault on the Lord's Deity, perpetuated by the NIV, JB, NWT<sup>8</sup> p 77, 78, in Acts 8:37, Ray states "*One of the most outstanding testimonies to the Deity of the Lord Jesus is in Acts 8:37. Before his baptism the eunuch said: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Most modern versions...omit this verse; yet Acts 8:37 is mentioned by both Irenaeus and Cyprian in the second and third centuries. This proves that this verse must have been in codices of both the Greek and Latin churches long before the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts were brought into existence.*"

Ray gives further examples of Origen's and Eusebius's' philosophical influence of the corrupted New Testament manuscripts as follows:

*"It is important to notice that the term "Lord" is taken away from Jesus. At other times Jesus is taken away from "Lord." Many more changes of this kind are made in the New American Standard Bible and others\*. Thus, the Arian teaching, that the Lord Jesus Christ is not fully equal to God, but occupies a place of subordination is still with us today..."*

\*Including the NIV, which repeatedly matches the NASV in departures from the AV1611.

Ray<sup>19</sup> p 33ff lists 162 New Testament references that are omitted or otherwise distorted from the true Text of the AV1611 in various modern versions, thanks ultimately to the influence of Origen, Eusebius and/or the corruptions in Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and their handful of allies. Ray has since updated the list to 200<sup>20</sup>. Of these, the NIV follows 195 of the corruptions. It agrees with the NWT in approximately 90% of these corruptions, a figure that is typical for the NIV<sup>8</sup> p 210-11. See also **Appendix, Tables A1-A4**.

Inspection of the evidence thus far shows that White's notion of no "grand and complex conspiracies" with respect to the modern translations and their underlying Greek texts – see earlier – is well-nigh threadbare but yet more evidence will be advanced to draw as great distinction as possible between these corrupt versions and "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21, the AV1611.

The evidence will continue to show that, contrary to White's assertions, the modern versions *have* arisen from corrupt, for conspiratorial ends, the modern scholars *are* untrustworthy and the Lord *did* guide AV1611 translators.

### ***Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare***

We return to Wilkinson<sup>12</sup> p 194ff.

*"The defenders of the Textus Receptus...earnestly sought to follow the early church. The Eusebio-Origen [i.e. Alexandrian] text was the product of the intermingling of the pure Word of God and Greek philosophy in the mind of Origen. It might be called the adaptation of the Word of God to Gnosticism.*

*"Constantine...preferred the [bible] edited by Eusebius and written by Origen, the outstanding intellectual figure that had combined Christianity with Gnosticism in his philosophy, even as Constantine himself was the political genius that was seeking to unite Christianity with pagan Rome. Constantine regarded himself as the director and guardian of this anomalous world church...His predilection was for the type of Bible whose readings would give him a basis for his imperialistic ideas of the great state church, with ritualistic ostentation and unlimited central power. The philosophy of Origen was well suited to serve Constantine's religio-political theocracy.*

*"It is evident that the so-called Christian Emperor gave to the Papacy his endorsement of the Eusebio-Origen Bible. It was from this type of manuscript that Jerome translated the Latin Vulgate which became the authorized Catholic Bible for all time.*

*"The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know. The type of Bible selected by Constantine has held the dominating influence at all times in the history of the Catholic Church. This Bible was different from the Bible of the Waldenses,*

*and, a result of this difference, the Waldenses were the object of hatred and cruel persecution.”*

Wilkinson shows how the centuries-long warfare continued, between the true bible believers who upheld the Received Text forming the basis for the AV1611 and the Catholic conspiracy based on the corrupted texts that spawned the modern versions. That warfare raged “*in the Greek Empire, the countries of Syrian Christianity, in northern Italy, in southern France, and in the British Isles.*”

Wilkinson also shows that the Textus Receptus-based bibles can be traced to the second century AD, “*a full century or more before the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus saw the light of day*” and that “*When the apostles of the Roman Catholic Church entered these countries in later centuries they found the people using the Textus Receptus; and it was not without great difficulty and a struggle that they were able to displace it with their Latin Vulgate.*” He continues, “*the Textus Receptus belongs to the type of these early apostolic manuscripts that were brought from Judea, and its claim to priority over the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus will be established.*”

*“The Received Text had authority enough to become, either in itself or by its translation, the Bible of the great Syrian Church; of the Waldensian Church of northern Italy; of the Gallic Church in southern France; and of the Celtic Church in Scotland and Ireland; as well as the official Bible of the Greek Catholic Church. All these churches, some earlier, some later, were in opposition to the Church of Rome and at a time when the Received Text and these Bibles of the Constantine type were rivals. They, as represented in their descendants, are rivals to this day.”*

Of early Syrian Christianity, Wilkinson writes, “*It is generally admitted that the Bible was translated from the original languages into Syrian about 150 AD. This version is known as the Peshitto (the correct or simple). This Bible even today generally follows the Received Text...of the type from which the Protestant Bibles, such as the King James in English, and the Lutheran in German, were translated. We shall presently see that it differed greatly from the Eusebio-Origen Greek New Testament.*”

Of early English Christianity, he writes, “*Since Italy, France, and Great Britain were once provinces of the Roman Empire, the first translations of the Bible by the early Christians in those parts were made into Latin. The early Latin translations were very dear to the hearts of these primitive Christians, and as Rome did not send any missionaries toward the West before 250 AD, the early Latin Bibles were well established before these churches came into conflict with Rome. Not only were such translations in existence long before the Vulgate was adopted by the Papacy, and well established, but the people for centuries refused to supplant their old Latin Bibles by the Vulgate.*” Citing the historian Jacobus, Wilkinson adds, “*“The Old Latin versions were used longest by the western Christians who would not bow to the authority of Rome – e.g., the Donatists, the Irish in Ireland, Britain and the Continent, the Albigenses, etc.”*”

He continues, “*For nine hundred years, we are told, the first Latin translations held their own after the Vulgate appeared [about 380 AD]...at the famous Council of Toulouse, 1229 AD, the Pope gave orders for the most terrible crusade to be waged against the simple Christians of southern France and northern Italy who would not bow to his power. Cruel, relentless, devastating, this war was waged, destroying the Bibles, books and every vestige of documents telling the story of the Waldenses and Albigenses.*”

Rome’s tactics with England, according to Wilkinson, had been to send the monk Augustine there in 596 AD, who urged the invading Anglo-Saxons to wipe out the rem-

nants of ancient British Christianity. He then replaced the Latin Bible of the early British Christians with the Vulgate of the Papacy to found the new Anglo-Saxon Church, that remained under Papal dominion until the English Reformation of the sixteenth century.

In speaking of early French Christianity, Wilkinson states, *“The French received their Christianity from Asia Minor. These apostolic Christians in southern France were undoubtedly those who gave effective help on carrying the Gospel to Great Britain. And as we have seen above, there was a long and bitter struggle between the Bible of the British Christians and the Bible which was brought later to England by the missionaries of Rome. And as there were really only two Bibles – the official version of Rome, and the Received Text – we may safely conclude that the Gallic (or French) Bible, as well as the Celtic (or British) were translations based on the Received Text.”*

Citing historian Neander, Wilkinson declares, *“But the peculiarity of the later British church is evidence against its origin from Rome; for in many ritual matters it departed from the usage of the Roman Church, and agreed much more nearly with the churches of Asia Minor. It withstood, for a long time, the authority of the Romish Papacy. This circumstance would seem to indicate that the Britons had received their Christianity, either immediately, or through Gaul, from Asia Minor.”*

Of the Waldenses of northern Italy, Wilkinson states, *“When Christianity, emerging from the long persecutions of pagan Rome, was raised to imperial favour by the Emperor Constantine, the Italic Church in northern Italy – later the Waldenses – is seen standing in opposition to papal Rome. Their Bible was of the family of the renowned Itala. It was this translation into Latin which represents the Received Text...The Latin Bible, the Italic, was translated from the Greek not later than 157 AD...”*

*“That Rome in early days corrupted the manuscripts while the Italic Church handed them down in their apostolic purity, Allix, the renowned scholar, testifies. He reports the following as apostolic articles of faith: “They receive only, saith he, what is written in the Old and New Testament. They say, that the Popes of Rome, and other priests, have de-praved the Scriptures by their doctrines and glosses.”*”

Wilkinson <sup>12 p 212ff</sup> shows that the Authorised Version of 1611 is of the same Text as that of the Waldensian Bible dating from the second century AD.

*“Waldensian influence, both from the Waldensian Bibles and Waldensian relationships, entered into the King James translation of 1611...The translators of 1611 had before them four Bibles which had come under Waldensian influences: the Diodati in Italian, the Olivetan in French, the Lutheran in German, and the Genevan in English. We have every reason to believe that they had access to at least six Waldensian Bibles written in the old Waldensian vernacular.”*

Wilkinson cites Dr Frederick Nolan who spent twenty-eight years tracing the Received Text back to its apostolic origin. Nolan concluded that the Waldensian Church, with its pre-1611 Latin Bibles furnished *“unequivocal testimony of a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church, that the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses\* was adopted in the version which prevailed in the Latin Church, previously to the introduction of the modern Vulgate.”*

\*1 John 5:7.

Of the transmission of the Received Text to the Waldensian Church and the preservation of the true scriptures during the Dark Ages, Wilkinson states, *“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might*



*have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy...*

*“The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text – the Textus Receptus, if you please – arose from the place of humiliation forced on it by Origen’s Bible in the hands of Constantine and became the Received Text of Greek Christianity. And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text.*

*“To Christians such as these, preserving apostolic Christianity, the world owes gratitude for the true text of the Bible. It is not true, as the Roman Church claims, that she gave the Bible to the world. What she gave was an impure text, a text with thousands of verses so changed as to make way for her unscriptural doctrines. While upon those who possessed the veritable Word of God, she poured out through long centuries her stream of cruel persecution. Or in the words of [Nolan]:*

*““The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution...Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith...In a most wonderful manner it (the Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness.””*

### ***The God-Honoured Text of the Reformation and 1611***

Wilkinson refers to Erasmus, “*that outstanding scholar,*” who “*divided all Greek manuscripts into two classes: those which agreed with the Received Text and those which agreed with the Vaticanus manuscript.*”

It was from the first class that Erasmus compiled his Greek New Testament that he gave to the Reformation. And God guided Erasmus’s division because, as Wilkinson states, “*The King James from the Received Text has been the Bible of the English-speaking world for 300 years. This has given the Received Text, and the Bibles translated from it into other tongues, standing and authority. At the same time, it neutralised the dangers of the Catholic manuscripts and the Bibles in other tongues translated from them.*”

The conspiracy amounting to warfare that pitted the corrupt Alexandrian text against the true text of the scriptures continued unabated. Wilkinson<sup>12 p 216ff</sup> describes how the Pope in about 400 AD implored Jerome of Bethlehem to produce a Latin bible based on Constantine’s Origenistic Greek Bible to overthrow the true Latin Bible that the Waldenses possessed. At the Pope’s insistence, although against his better judgement, Jerome reproduced the seven apocryphal books found in Origen’s the Old Testament, because Origen’s doctrines, “*purgatory and transubstantiation, had now become...essential to the imperialism of the Papacy as was the teaching that tradition had equal authority with the Scriptures.*”

James White’s book reveals that he is of a similar persuasion to Origen in his approach to the scriptures. Wilkinson continues to highlight the distinction between the true scriptures and the corrupt sources underlying the modern versions.

*“Jerome in his early years had been brought up with an enmity to the Received Text, then universally known as the Greek Vulgate. The word Vulgate means “commonly used,” or “current.” This word Vulgate has been appropriated from the Bible to which it rightfully belongs, that is, to the Received Text, and given to the Latin Bible. In fact, it took hun-*

*dreds of years before the common people would call Jerome's Latin Bible, the Vulgate. The very fact that in Jerome's day the Greek Bible, from which the King James is translated into English, was called the Vulgate, is proof in itself that, in the church of the living God, its authority was supreme...*

*"The hostility of Jerome to the Received Text made him necessary to the Papacy. The Papacy in the Latin world opposed the authority of the Greek Vulgate. Did it not see already this hated Greek Vulgate, long ago translated into Latin, read, preached from, and circulated by those Christians in Northern Italy who refused to bow beneath its rule? For this reason it sought the great reputation Jerome enjoyed as a scholar..."*

*"In preparing the Latin Bible, Jerome would gladly have gone all the way in transmitting to us the corruptions in the text of Eusebius, but he did not dare. Great scholars of the West were already exposing him and the corrupted Greek manuscripts. Jerome especially mentions Luke 2:33 (where the Received Text read: "And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him," while Jerome's text read: "His father and his mother marvelled," etc.) to say that the great scholar Helvidius, who from the circumstances of the case was probably a Vaudois [Waldensian], accused him of using corrupted Greek manuscripts."*

White attempts to justify this corruption<sup>3 p 218</sup> but like Helvidius of Jerome's time, modern researchers have vindicated the true reading, as found in the AV1611<sup>8 p 69, 339ff, 9 p 86</sup>.

This was but one error. Wilkinson<sup>12 p 221</sup> notes that at the time of the Reformation, *"a millennium later, when Greek manuscripts and Greek learning were again general, the corrupt readings of the Vulgate were noted. Even Catholic scholars of repute, before Protestantism was fully under way, pointed out its thousands of errors."*

The modern versions perpetuate many of these errors and White champions them, as will be shown. Wilkinson has this telling comment about their effect, which has its counterpart in our time, as will also be shown.

*"The Reformation did not make great progress until after the Received Text had been restored to the world. The Reformers were not satisfied with the Latin Vulgate."*

*"The papal leaders did not comprehend the vast departure from the truth they had created when they had rejected the lead of the pure teachings of the Scriptures. The spurious books of the Vulgate opened the door for the mysterious and the dark doctrines which had confused the thinking of the ancients. The corrupt readings of the genuine books decreased the confidence of people in inspiration and increased the power of the priests. All were left in a labyrinth of darkness from which there was no escape."*

Though light was beginning to dawn, as early as the thirteenth century, as Wilkinson shows.

*"Throughout the centuries, the Waldenses and other faithful evangelicals had sown the seed. The fog was rolling away from the plains and hills of Europe. The pure Bible which long had sustained the faith of the Vaudois, was soon to be adopted by others so mighty that they would shake Europe from the Alps to the North Sea. "The light had begun spreading unobserved, and the Reformation was on the point of being anticipated. The demon Innocent III was the first to decry the streaks of day on the crest of the Alps. Horror-stricken, he started up, and began to thunder for his pandemonium against a faith which...was threatening to dissolve the power of Rome" [Wylie]..."*

*"It must be remembered that at the time (about 400 A.D.) when the Empire was breaking up into modern kingdoms, the pure Latin was breaking up into the Spanish Latin, the*

*French Latin, the African Latin, and other dialects, the forerunners of many modern languages. Into all those different Latins the Bible had been translated, in whole or in part. Some of these, as the Bible of the Waldenses, had come mediately or immediately from the Received Text and had great influence.”*

Erasmus of Rotterdam pioneered the publication of the Greek Textus Receptus<sup>8 p 18ff</sup> and White attempts to cast Erasmus in the role of a modern version editor attacked by KJV-onlyists, who are likened to supporters of Jerome’s Vulgate<sup>3 p 54ff</sup>. White also marvels at Erasmus’s ability “*to produce such a fine text with so few resources.*”

White overlooks the fact that Erasmus’s most bitter opponents were Catholic priests who favoured the corrupt Vulgate, progenitor of the modern versions that White defends. White also misleads about the resources available to Erasmus, notably overlooking the Waldenses’s faithful preservation of the Received Text in Latin.

Wilkinson is able to correct him in both respects<sup>12 p 223ff</sup>.

*“The priests loudly denounced [new learning]. They declared that the study of Greek was of the devil and prepared to destroy all who promoted it.”*

*“There were hundreds of manuscripts for Erasmus to examine, and he did; but he used only a few. What matters? The vast bulk of manuscripts in Greek are practically all the Received Text. If the few Erasmus used were typical, that is, after he had thoroughly balanced the evidence of many and used a few which displayed that balance, did he not, with all the problems before him, arrive at practically the same result which only could be arrived at today by a fair and comprehensive investigation? Moreover, the text he chose had such an outstanding history in the Greek, the Syrian, and the Waldensian Churches, that it constituted an irresistible argument of God’s providence. **God did not write a hundred Bibles; there is only one Bible, the others at best are only approximations. In other words the Greek New Testament of Erasmus, known as the Received Text, is none other than the Greek New Testament which successfully met the rage of its pagan and papal enemies** [emphasis in text].”*

And the meddling of James White, who having cited Dr Otis Fuller’s book in his bibliography, could have saved himself many hours wasted in front of the computer screen if he had made a genuine effort to read Benjamin Wilkinson’s work.

***“Through desire a man, having separated himself, seeketh and intermeddleth with all wisdom”*** Proverbs 18:1.

That Erasmus compiled sufficient sources for his work and that the great mass of Greek manuscripts from which they were drawn differed only in superficial details – despite White’s assertion<sup>3 p 40</sup> of “*the wide range of textual variants in the New Testament*” – Wilkinson demonstrates with citations from two members of the 1870-1881 Revision Committee<sup>12 p 227</sup>, “*that body so hostile to the Greek New Testament of Erasmus.*”

*“The manuscripts which Erasmus used, differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details from the bulk of the cursive manuscripts, — that is to say, the manuscripts which are written in running hand and not in capital or (as they are technically called) uncial letters. The general character of their text is the same. By this observation the pedigree of the Received Text is carried up beyond the individual manuscripts used by Erasmus to a great body of manuscripts of which the earliest are assigned to the ninth century”*

*“Then after quoting Doctor Hort, they draw this conclusion on his statement:*

*“This remarkable statement completes the pedigree of the Received Text. That pedigree stretches back to a remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was, as Dr. Hort is careful to remind us, at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any one of them.”*

But Catholic-inspired war against the true scriptures continued after the publication of Erasmus’s work. Wilkinson<sup>12 p 228ff</sup> traces the life and ministry of William Tyndale<sup>8 p 22</sup>, *“the true hero of the English Reformation,”* who laid the foundation for the Authorised Holy Bible of 1611.

*“Two thirds of the Bible was translated into English by Tyndale, and what he did not translate was finished by those who worked with him and were under the spell of his genius. The Authorized Bible of the English language is Tyndale’s, after his work passed through two or three revisions.”*

On the basis that allegedly<sup>3 p 40</sup>, *“no textual variants...materially disrupt or destroy any essential doctrine of the Christian faith,”* White tries to play down differences between the AV1611 and modern versions (though still reserving the ‘right’ to construct his own text<sup>3 p 26</sup>, according to his own particular *“tastes”*).

The enemies of the true scriptures thought otherwise, as Wilkinson shows in his chapter on the Jesuit Bible of 1582<sup>12 p 231ff</sup>.

*“So instant and so powerful was the influence of Tyndale’s gift upon England, that Catholicism, through those newly formed papal invincibles, called the Jesuits, sprang to its feet and brought forth, in the form of a Jesuit New Testament, the most effective instrument of learning the Papacy, up to that time, had produced in the English language. This newly invented rival version advanced to the attack, and we are now called to consider how a crisis in the world’s history was met when the Jesuit Bible became a challenge to Tyndale’s translation.”*

### ***The Jesuits – ‘Engineer Corps of Hell’***

The Jesuits entered the conspiratorial fray via the Council of Trent, 1545.

*“The opening decrees of the Council of Trent had set the pace for centuries to come. They pointed out the line of battle which the Catholic reaction would wage against the Reformation. First undermine the Bible, then destroy the Protestant teaching and doctrine.”*

White’s book certainly helps undermine belief in the Authorised Holy Bible of 1611 as the final authority in matters of faith and practice. Wilkinson explains the specific reason for the Jesuit intrigue.

*“Sixty years elapsed from the close of the council of Trent (1563), to the landing of the Pilgrims in America. During those sixty years, England had been changing from a Catholic nation to a Bible-loving people.”*

No modern version has achieved an equivalent result.

Wilkinson continues.

*“The burning desire to give the common people the Holy Word of God, was the reason why Tyndale had translated it into English. No such reason impelled the Jesuits at Rheims. In the preface of their Rheims New Testament [of 1582], they state that it was not translated into English because it was necessary that the Bible should be in the mother tongue, or that God had appointed the Scriptures to be read by all; but from the*

*special consideration of the state of their mother country. This translation was intended to do on the inside of England, what the great navy of Philip II was to do on the outside. One was to be used as a moral attack, the other as a physical attack; both to reclaim England. The preface especially urged that those portions be committed to memory “which made most against heretics.”*

*“The principal object of the Rhemish translators was not only to circulate their doctrines through the country, but also to depreciate as much as possible the English translations” [citing Brooke].*

In favour of Romish versions, as White’s book does. See remarks on Matthew 18:11, **Appendix** and what follows in the discussions on the subsequent chapters of White’s book.

Thanks to the depth of bible-belief in Elizabethan England and the scholarship of the noted puritan, Thomas Cartwright, who exposed the corruptions of the Jesuit Douay-Rheims Bible, the English people rejected the 1582 version. It was subsequently changed to approximate the AV1611 in order to make it more acceptable in England and, much altered, finally appeared at the Challoner Version of 1752.

Wilkinson therefore notes<sup>12 p 241ff</sup> that *“if you seek to compare the Douay with the American Revised Version, you will find that the older, or first Douay of 1582, is more like it in Catholic readings than those editions of today, inasmuch as the 1582 Version had been doctored and redoctored. Yet, even in the later editions, you will find many of those corruptions which the Reformers denounced and which reappear in the American Revised Version.”*

It is possible that the 1582 JR version notionally available the internet is in fact largely the Challoner DR of 1749-52, because the two versions are found to match in virtually all references cited.

Nevertheless, the **Appendix** to this work essentially bears out Wilkinson’s observations with respect to reinsertion of Catholic corruptions, which is no doubt Jesuit-inspired. The text of the American RV is essentially that of the 1881-4 English Revised Version, progenitor of the modern versions such as the NIV. Note again that of the 241 passages of scripture to which White refers for comparison between the AV1611 and the modern versions, the NIV matches the (Challoner) DR and the JR 1582 NT in 28% of them. But it shows a 70% affinity with the Catholic JB in company with its ally, the NWT of Watchtower. (A larger sample of verses, 15% of the New Testament, indicates that the affinity between the NIV, JB, NWT is as high as 80%, with respect to their agreed departures from the AV1611<sup>8 p211</sup>.)

This is clear evidence that with the AV1611 having been deceptively marginalized in the last 120 years for many professing (and gullible) members of the Lord’s English-speaking people, modern scholars are steadily resorting to the full set of Catholic corruptions, including omissions, that the Reformers rejected, with respect to the modern texts. See also Ray’s analysis of 200 New Testament references encapsulating major doctrine, mentioned earlier. It follows that modern scholars are *not* to be trusted, thus refuting the third of White’s six postulates. See remarks at the beginning of this section. More evidence to this effect will be advanced subsequently.

### ***God's Book – the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible***

The Jesuit subterfuge was dealt a massive blow by the Authorised Holy Bible that burst on the scene in 1611<sup>8 p 24ff</sup>. Wilkinson states.

*“Every energy pulsating with certainty and hope, English Protestantism brought forth a perfect\* masterpiece. They gave to the world what has been considered by hosts of scholars, the greatest version ever produced in any language, — the King James Bible, called “The Miracle of English Prose.” This was not taken from the Latin in either the Old or the New Testament, but from the languages in which God originally wrote His Word, namely, from the Hebrew in the Old Testament and from the Greek in the New.”*

\*i.e. the Authorised Holy Bible of 1611 is a *perfect* Bible. It *cannot* be improved upon, certainly not by the speculations of James White.

But the conspiratorial subterfuge would continue. The aim remained the same, to “**corrupt the word of God**” 2 Corinthians 2:17 and replace it with the authority of the Pope. Wilkinson remarks.

*“The Jesuits had therefore before them a double task, — both to supplant the authority of the Greek of the Received Text by another Greek New Testament, and then upon this mutilated foundation, to bring forth a new English version which might retire into the background, the King James. In other words, they must, before they could again give standing to the Vulgate, bring Protestantism to accept a mutilated Greek text and an English version based upon it.*

*“The manuscripts from which the New Version must be taken, would be like the Greek manuscripts which Jerome used in producing the Vulgate. The opponents of the King James Version would even do more. They would enter the field of the Old Testament, namely, the Hebrew, and, from the many translations of it into Greek in the early centuries, seize whatever advantages they could. In other words, the Jesuits had put forth one Bible in English, that of 1582, as we have seen; of course, they could get out another.”*

In 1749-52, the Jesuits produced the complete Douay-Rheims bible. Further modified by the RV, herein lies the genesis of today's NIV and other corruptions. Unknowingly or otherwise, James White is enthusiastically assisting the sons of Loyola in their diabolical 'ministry.'

But progress was slow. The Jesuits had to contend with the perfect masterpiece of English Protestantism – the AV1611.

Wilkinson demonstrates how the translation was clearly guided by God<sup>12 p 244ff</sup> and not merely the result of human effort, refuting another of White's main postulates, that the AV1611 is “*a great, yet imperfect translation,*” though severely limited with respect to Hebrew and Greek by our “*less rich English tongue*” and contemptuously dismissed by him as “*a seventeenth-century Anglican translation of the Bible,*” i.e. not God's word but merely a flawed Anglican imitation of the 'true' (undefined) Bible<sup>3 p iv, vi, vii, viii\*</sup>. White's statement in this respect is not only false<sup>8, p 217ff</sup> but incomplete. Again, the question must be asked, what, according to White, is “*the Bible*”? He does not say but he should do so, given his concern for “*the entirety of the Bible*” and “*the highest standard of truth.*”

Once again, White is being inconsistent. Were he not so inclined to despise Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, and her painstaking research, he could benefit considerably from a thorough study of her latest works, *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word*. (I believe that the Lord Jesus Christ will close down the Church Age, Revelation 2, 3 with the second of those two volumes.)

\*White makes reference to “*Scripture*” and “*God’s revealed truth,*” without ever stating where they can be found unequivocally between two covers.

Wilkinson describes the state of the English language in the early seventeenth century, revealing that God’s timing for the AV1611 was perfect.

*“We now come, however, to a very striking situation which is little observed and rarely mentioned by those who discuss the merits of the King James Bible. The English language in 1611 was in the very best condition to receive into its bosom the Old and New Testaments\*. Each word was broad, simple, and generic. That is to say, words were capable of containing in themselves not only their central thoughts, but also all the different shades of meaning which were attached to that central thought. Since then, words have lost that living, pliable breadth...*

*“It will be readily seen that while the English vocabulary has increased in quantity, nevertheless, single words have lost their many shades, combinations of words have become fixed, capable of only one meaning, and therefore less adaptable to receiving into English the thoughts of the Hebrew which likewise is a simple, broad, generic language...*

*“New Testament Greek is, in this respect, like the Hebrew. When our English Bible was revised, the Revisers labored under the impression that the sacred writers of the Greek New Testament did not write in the everyday language of the common people. Since then the accumulated stores of archaeological findings have demonstrated that the language of the Greek New Testament was the language of the simple, ordinary people, rather than the language of scholars; and is flexible, broad, generic, like the English of 1611.”*

\*Wilkinson does draw a distinction between the written language of the AV1611 and the spoken language of the day. He says, *“The translators wisely preserved what was good in the earlier translations, with the result that the language of our English Bible is not the language of the age in which the translators lived, but in its grand simplicity stands out in contrast to the ornate and often affected diction of the time.”* See also this author’s summary comments elsewhere<sup>8 p 29, 206ff</sup>.

In sum, the language of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible was in no way “*less rich*” than that of Hebrew or Greek. It was – and is - perfectly suited for its God-given purpose, to demonstrate that ***“The counsel of the LORD standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations”*** Psalm 33:11. White is wrong again.

As more evidence of God’s timing, Wilkinson then points to the provision of the materials necessary and the fact that the King James translators were aware of all the modern textual variants but rejected them as corrupt. See also the summary of the materials by this author<sup>8 p 26-27</sup>.

*“In view of the vast stores of material which were available to verify the certainty of the Bible at the time of the Reformation, and the prodigious labors of the Reformers in this material for a century, it is very erroneous to think that they had not been sufficiently overhauled by 1611.*

*“It is an exaggerated idea, much exploited by those who are attacking the Received Text, that we of the present have greater resources of information, as well as more valuable, than had the translators of 1611. The Reformers themselves considered their sources of information perfect.*

*“Doctor Fulke says:*

*““But as for the Hebrew and Greek that now is, (it) may easily be proved to be the same that always hath been; neither is there any diversity in sentence, howsoever some copies, either through negligence of the writer, or by any other occasion, do vary from that which is commonly and most generally received in some letters, syllables, or words.”*

*“We cannot censure the Reformers for considering their sources of information sufficient and authentic enough to settle in their minds the infallible inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, since we have a scholar of repute to-day rating their material as high as the material of the present. Doctor Jacobus thus indicates the relative value of information available to Jerome, to the translators of the King James, and to the Revisers of 1900:*

*““On the whole, the differences in the matter of the sources available in 390, 1590, and 1890 are not very serious.””*

Nor had the situation changed appreciably in the latter half of the twentieth century, insofar as the NIV translators assure us that Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are still<sup>8 p 66, 74</sup> *“The most reliable early manuscripts”* with respect to the allegedly disputed passages, Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11. The New Revised Standard Version<sup>21</sup>, published 1989, 1995, encloses these passages in double braces, indicating that the translating committee considered them doubtful.

Of the old uncial or uppercase manuscripts used by the 1881 Revisers to alter the Authorised Text, Wilkinson states<sup>12 p 252ff</sup>.

*“The Catholic Encyclopaedia does not omit to tell us that the New Testament from Acts on, in Codex A (the Alexandrinus), agrees with the Vatican Manuscript. If the problems presented by the Alexandrinus Manuscript, and consequently by the Vaticanus, were so serious, why were we obliged to wait till 1881-1901 to learn of the glaring mistakes of the translators of the King James, when the manuscript arrived in England in 1627? The Forum informs us that 250 different versions of the Bible were tried in England between 1611 and now, but they all fell flat before the majesty of the King James. Were not the Alexandrinus and the Vaticanus able to aid these 250 versions, and overthrow the other Bible, resting, as the critics explain, on an insecure foundation?*

*“The case with the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus is no better. The problems presented by these two manuscripts were well known, not only to the translators of the King James, but also to Erasmus. We are told that the Old Testament portion of the Vaticanus has been printed since 1587...*

*“We are informed by another author that, if Erasmus had desired, he could have secured a transcript of this manuscript. There was no necessity, however, for Erasmus to obtain a transcript because he was in correspondence with Professor Paulus Bombasius at Rome, who sent him such variant readings as he wished...*

*“Erasmus, however, rejected these varying readings of the Vatican MS. because he considered from the massive evidence of his day that the Received Text was correct.”*

Although the King James translators did not have access to the Sinaitic manuscript, its absence from their materials was unimportant. Wilkinson states.

*“We have already given authorities to show that the Sinaitic MS. is a brother of the Vaticanus. Practically all of the problems of any serious nature which are presented by the Sinaitic, are the problems of the Vaticanus. Therefore the translators of 1611 had available all the variant readings of these manuscripts and rejected them.*



*“The following words from Dr. Kenrick, Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, will support the conclusion that the translators of the King James knew the readings of Codices Aleph, A, B, C, D, where they differed from the Received Text and denounced them. Bishop Kenrick published an English translation of the Catholic Bible in 1849. I quote from the preface:*

*““Since the famous manuscripts of Rome, Alexandria, Cambridge, Paris, and Dublin, were examined... a verdict has been obtained in favor of the Vulgate.*

*““At the Reformation, the Greek text, as it then stood, was taken as a standard, in conformity to which the versions of the Reformers were generally made; whilst the Latin Vulgate was depreciated [sic], or despised, as a mere version.”*

*“In other words, the readings of these much boasted manuscripts, recently made available are those of the Vulgate. The Reformers knew of these readings and rejected them, as well as the Vulgate.”*

And bible believers should rightly reject the sickly descendants of the Vulgate, such as the NIV, NRSV and the related sterile hybrid, the NKJV. Wilkinson again:

*“Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the translators of 1611 did not have access to the problems of the Alexandrinus, the Sinaiticus, and the Vaticanus by direct contact with these uncials. It mattered little. They had other manuscripts accessible which presented all the same problems. We are indebted for the following information to Dr. F. C. Cook, editor of the “Speaker’s Commentary,” chaplain to the Queen of England, who was invited to sit on the Revision Committee, but refused:*

*““That Textus Receptus was taken in the first instance, from late cursive manuscripts; but its readings are maintained only so far as they agree with the best ancient versions, with the earliest and best Greek and Latin Fathers, and with the vast majority of uncial and cursive manuscripts.”*

*“It is then clear that among the great body of cursive and uncial manuscripts which the Reformers possessed, the majority agreed with the Received Text; there were a few, however, among these documents which belonged to the counterfeit family. These dissenting few presented all the problems which can be found in the Alexandrinus, the Vaticanus, and the Sinaiticus. In other words, the translators of the King James came to a diametrically opposite conclusion from that arrived at by the Revisers of 1881, although the men of 1611, as well as those of 1881, had before them the same problems and the same evidence.”*

J. A. Moorman<sup>9 p 26-27</sup> has a telling comment in this respect.

*“The Doctrinal Text of the Authorized Version receives Majority...support for 90% of its 356 doctrinally distinct passages\*, whereas 86% of the cursive support for the diminished text [i.e. the NIV\*\*] is only “others” or “a few”. On this subject, I would also like to recommend to you my When The KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text – available from the Dean Burgon Society...*

*“Textual criticism has long sought to find cursives among the 2,800 which diverge substantially from the Traditional Text. It has been a difficult search! Not many have been found, and those few that do divert have had the most made of them. For example, MS 33 is close to Vaticanus in the Gospels, this led Hort and others to call it “the best of the miniscules, the queen of the cursives.” But alas, the “Queen” loses her crown in the rest of the N.T., for it reverts...(or nearly so) to the Traditional Text. Rarely, if ever, is there consistent or anything approaching complete divergence.”*

\*That Moorman compiled for comparison between the AV1611 and the NIV. His thorough analysis of these passages shows that where they are extant, even the old uncials used for the NIV and other modern translations, e.g. the JB, NWT, Codices Aleph, A, B, C, D, do not together show unequivocal support for the NIV:

*“While B, and to a lesser extent Aleph are on the side of the diminished text, the combined figures for the [other] uncials reveal a stand-off (425-455)\*\*\*. Hardly the overwhelming support Modern Version proponents claim from these sources! Again we ask, if they cannot get support decisive support from the “five old Uncials” where are they going to find it? Just about everywhere else we look in these summaries shows that they are on the losing end of the evidence.”*

\*\*The AV1611 contains 790,704 words, the NIV 726,606. The NIV short-changes the reader by 64,098 words<sup>22</sup>.

\*\*\*AV1611 versus the NIV. Even with Aleph and B included, the support for the modern versions is still not overwhelming, with comparative figures of 579 versus 896 or approximately 2-3. Only the papyri fragments decisively support the NIV in the doctrinal passages, 39-182 – though not overall<sup>8 p 129ff</sup>. The other uncials, besides Aleph, A, B, C, D, as a whole support the AV1611 Text by well over 2-1 and even the cursives favoured by the modern version supporters, consisting of about 18 known manuscripts, grouped in Families 1 and 13, by 3-1<sup>9 p 17ff</sup>.

Concerning the observed departures of the AV1611 Text from the ‘Majority,’ see comments at the beginning of this section. Moorman states<sup>11 p 27-28</sup>:

*“There are a number of readings in the King James Version which on the basis of current information do seem to have a minority of MS support. In the following pages we will show that there is nevertheless quite substantial support for these passages.*

#### **“SEVERAL PRINCIPLES TO KEEP IN MIND**

*“In the previous pages we have shown that the defence of the King James Bible has been the very last thing on the mind of Textual Criticism. Almost all energy has been directed toward “reconstructing” the text on the basis of a few old uncials, and ferreting out what little support can be gathered for these MSS. The evidence I have gathered is probably as extensive as any now available. Yet in comparison to what could be gathered by a first-hand search of all the MSS, it is only a few scraps from the tables of men who treat the Authorised Version with scholarly contempt!*

*“Our extant MSS reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89, Jude 3). After the advent of printing (AD 1450), the necessity of God preserving the MS witness to the text was diminished. Therefore, in some instances the majority of MSS extant today may not reflect at every point what the true, commonly accepted, and majority reading was 500 years ago...*

*“Certainly in Revelation and to a lesser extent in the rest of the New Testament we must occasionally look to the Latin West for corroboration on a disputed reading. The Latin Christians who opposed Rome had a far more vital faith than that which usually characterized the Greek East. We look to them for our spiritual heritage, and they were an important channel through which God preserved His Word. This helps explain why there is a sprinkling of Latin readings in the Authorized Version. Remember also that many of the great doctrinal words in our English Bible are based on a Latin and not Greek derivative.*

*“Christ promised that the Holy Spirit would guide believers of each generation “into all truth” (John 16:13). With regard to the text of Scripture, “all truth” was found in one*

*primary source with some complement from another. The primary source was the Greek speaking East with occasional refinement and verification from the Latin and Syriac areas.*

*“When a version has been the standard for as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with. And in those comparatively few places where it seems to depart from the majority reading, it would be far more honouring to God’s promises of preservation to believe that the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!”*

Such references where White erroneously thinks otherwise will be dealt with in the course of this work. To return to Wilkinson’s assessment of the scope of the material available to the 1611 translators:

*“We give a further testimony from another eminent authority [Hoskier]:*

*““Our experience among the Greek cursives proves to us that transmission has not been careless, and they do represent a wholesome traditional text in the passages involving doctrine and so forth.”*

*“As to the large number of manuscripts in existence, we have every reason to believe that the Reformers were far better acquainted with them than later scholars. Doctor Jacobus in speaking of textual critics of 1582, says:*

*““The present writer has been struck with the critical acumen shown at that date (1582), and the grasp of the relative value of the common Greek manuscripts and the Latin version.”*

*“On the other hand, if more manuscripts have been made accessible since 1611, little use has been made of what we had before and of the majority of those made available since. The Revisers systematically ignored the whole world of manuscripts and relied practically on only three or four. As Dean Burgon says, “But nineteen-twentieths of those documents, for any use which has been made of them, might just as well be still lying in the monastic libraries from which they were obtained.” We feel, therefore, that a mistaken picture of the case has been presented with reference to the material at the disposition of the translators of 1611 and concerning their ability to use that material.”*

These searching overviews contrast starkly with White’s superficial treatment of the available sources, as will be seen.

Wilkinson<sup>12 p 257ff</sup> continues with noting the extreme care with which the 1611 translators approached their task, with the result *“that each part of the work was carefully gone over at least fourteen times. It was further understood that if there was any special difficulty or obscurity, all the learned men of the land could be called upon by letter for their judgment. And finally each bishop kept the clergy of his diocese notified concerning the progress of the work, so that if any one felt constrained to send any particular observations, he was notified to do so.”*

No modern version is subjected to this degree of thoroughness in its preparation, or openness. Wilkinson further describes the secrecy that surrounded the compilation of the Revised Version and Waite<sup>23 p 83ff</sup> describes in detail the superior techniques that the 1611 translators used for their work, compared to the modern translators. For example, to start the work, each member of the six companies had to translate individually each of the Books of scripture assigned to his company. Waite states that this was not done for mod-

ern versions such as the NIV. Only a small proportion of the translating committees do the actual translating. The rest help mainly with crosschecking other versions or improving style.

This disclosure further undermines White's notion that modern scholarship for today's versions is trustworthy.

With reference to the unrivalled scholarship of the King James translators, more evidence of the guidance of God, Wilkinson cites McClure, author of the detailed history of the AV1611's compilation, entitled *The Translators Revived*:

*“It is confidently expected,” says McClure, “that the reader of these pages will yield to the conviction that all the colleges of Great Britain and America, even in this proud day of boastings, could not bring together the same number of divines equally qualified by learning and piety for the great undertaking. Few indeed are the living names worthy to be enrolled with those mighty men. It would be impossible to convene out of any one Christian denomination, or out of all, a body of translators, on whom the whole Christian community would bestow such confidence as is reposed upon that illustrious company, or who would prove themselves as deserving of such confidence. Very many self-styled ‘improved versions’ of the Bible, or of parts of it, have been paraded before the world, but the religious public has doomed them all, without exception, to utter neglect.”*”

In the full version of his book, Wilkinson notes how the AV1611 was eulogised even by *“One of the brilliant minds of the last generation, Faber, who as a clergyman in the Church of England, labored to Romanize that body, and finally abandoned it for the Church of Rome, cried out, —*

*“Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country?”*”<sup>8 p 209</sup>

Unlike any of the modern versions, the AV1611 has held back the encroachment of the Devil's church, as Wilkinson shows in the full version of his book, in answer to Faber's lament:

*“Yes, more, it has not only been the stronghold of Protestantism in Great Britain, but it has built a gigantic wall as a barrier against the spread of Romanism.*

*“The printing of the English Bible has proved to be by far the mightiest barrier ever reared to repel the advance of Popery, and to damage all the resources of the Papacy [McClure].”*

*“Small wonder then that for three hundred years incessant warfare has been waged upon this instrument created by God to mold all constitutions and laws of the British Empire, and of the great American Republic, while at the same time comforting, blessing, and instructing the lives of the millions who inhabit these territories.*

*“Behold what it has given to the world! The machinery of the Catholic Church can never begin to compare with the splendid machinery of Protestantism. The Sabbath School, the Bible printing houses, the foreign missionary societies, the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Protestant denominational organizations, — these all were the offspring of Protestantism. Their benefits have gone to all lands and been adopted by practically all nations. Shall we throw away the Bible from which such splendid organizations have sprung?”*

As his book shows, White would, along with all supporters of the modern versions, to satisfy their egos. The result has been for the English-speaking nations that they are *“like a*

*city that is broken down, and without walls*” Proverbs 25:28b, invaded by *“the worst of the heathen”* Ezekiel 7:24a, exemplified in Britain from the traitorous politicians selling out to the Vatican-inspired EU, to pornographers like Rupert Murdoch, to the Muslim invaders who seek to claim Britain for Islam<sup>24 p 5</sup>.

Fundamental Christians who abandoned the Authorised Holy Bible for the modern versions must share the major part of the blame for this horrific state of affairs.

As God said to the prophet Jeremiah:

*“Thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will bring upon this city and upon all her towns all the evil that I have pronounced against it, because they have hardened their necks, that they might not hear my words”* Jeremiah 19:15.

*“This city”* and *“her towns”* are the cities and towns of Britain, suffering the consequences of rejecting God’s words according to the Authorised 1611 Holy Bible that God gave Britain at such great cost, deceived into rejecting those words by *professing fundamental Christians via the Romish modern versions such as the NIV*. See the **Appendix, Table A5** for more details. The references have been taken from the full version of Wilkinson’s work.

And the judgement is not done yet.

#### **Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness**

Wilkinson gives further evidence of the untrustworthiness of modern scholars who abandoned the AV1611 for the modern versions and of God’s guidance in the compilation and preservation of the 1611 Bible<sup>12 p 262ff</sup>.

*“And [the Reformers] contended that the Received Text, both in Hebrew and in Greek, as they had it in their day would so continue unto the end of time.”*

As the Lord Jesus Christ said, *“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away”* Matthew 24:35. And as Moorman points out, see above, the standard for the Received Text, in both Testaments, is the Authorized Holy Bible of 1611, not any one of the editions of the original languages. Wilkinson continues.

*“A testimony no less can be drawn from the opponents of the Received Text. The higher critics, who have constructed such elaborate scaffolding, and who have built such great engines of war as their apparatus criticus, are obliged to describe the greatness and strength of the walls they are attacking in order to justify their war machine...”*

*“Dr. Hort, who was an opponent of the Received Text and who dominated the English New Testament Revision Committee, says:*

*““An overwhelming proportion of the text in all known cursive manuscripts except a few is, as a matter of fact, identical.”*

*“Thus strong testimonies can be given not only to the Received Text, but also to the phenomenal ability of the manuscript scribes writing in different countries and in different ages to preserve an identical Bible in the overwhelming mass of manuscripts. The large number of conflicting readings which higher critics have gathered must come from only a few manuscripts, since the overwhelming mass of manuscripts is identical.”*

This is not what James White would have his readers believe<sup>3 p 36ff</sup>. He tries to sow doubt about God’s preservation of His words by implying that manuscript scribes for the Received Text manuscripts wilfully inserted man-made phrases in different Books of the New Testament to ‘harmonize’ them or make them read alike, e.g. Ephesians 1:2 and Co-

Colossians 1:2, with respect to the phrase *“and the Lord Jesus Christ”* preserved in the AV1611 but omitted by the RV, NIV, JB, NWT<sup>8 p 83</sup> on a paucity of evidence<sup>9 p 131</sup>. White, typically, ignores the evidence. His cavalier treatment of the Holy Bible amounts to blasphemy. Wilkinson continues.

*“The King James Bible had hardly begun its career before enemies commenced to fall upon it. Though it has been with us for three hundred years in splendid leadership — a striking phenomenon — nevertheless, as the years increase, the attacks become more furious. If the book were a dangerous document, a source of corrupting influence and a nuisance, we would wonder why it has been necessary to assail it since it would naturally die of its own weakness. But when it is a divine blessing of great worth, a faultless power of transforming influence, who can it be who are so stirred up as to deliver against it one assault after another? Great theological seminaries, in many lands, led by accepted teachers of learning, are laboring constantly to tear it to pieces. Point us out anywhere, any situation similar concerning the sacred books of any other religion, or even of Shakespeare, or of any other work of literature.*

*“Especially since 1814 when the Jesuits were restored by order of the Pope — if they needed restoration — have the attacks by Catholic scholars on the Bible, and by other scholars who are Protestants in name, become bitter.”*

The ‘scholarly’ bitterness against the Holy Bible continues to the present, from Protestant fundamentalists<sup>8 p 97ff</sup>.

*“[Citing Palmer] “For it must be said that the Roman Catholic or the Jesuitical system of argument — the work of the Jesuits from the sixteenth century to the present day — evinces an amount of learning and dexterity, a subtlety of reasoning, a sophistry, a plausibility combined, of which ordinary Christians have but little idea... Those who do so (take the trouble to investigate) find that, if tried by the rules of right reasoning, the argument is defective, assuming points which should be proved\*; that it is logically false, being grounded in sophisms\*\*; that it rests in many cases on quotations which are not genuine... on passages which, when collated with the original, are proved to be wholly inefficacious as proofs\*\*\*.””*

\*Like White’s assumption of alleged ‘harmonisations’ in the Received Text and AV1611. See above.

\*\*White uses the sophist term<sup>3 p 43, 46, 153, 177</sup> *“expansion of piety”* to infer that scribes for the majority of manuscripts added their own words to the Received Text manuscripts. He insists, for example, that the words *“and the Lord Jesus Christ”* in Colossians 1:2, AV1611, *“Jesus”* instead of *“He”* in passages such as Matthew 4:18, AV1611, and *“Lord Jesus Christ”* in passages such as Acts 15:11, AV1611, instead of *“Lord Jesus”* are manmade attempts *“to naturally expand the titles used of the Lord”*<sup>3 p 37-8 45-6</sup>. This is why, in White’s opinion, the Received Text or *“Byzantine text-type is “fuller” or “longer”*” than the Alexandrian text underlying the modern versions. Unfortunately for White, he has failed to observe that the AV1611 readings for Matthew 4:18 and Acts 15:11 are *not* from the majority of manuscripts<sup>9, 11</sup> and therefore don’t fit his explanation, which is in any case entirely unsupported by evidence and therefore amounts to nothing more than wild speculation. Nevertheless, in the same context, he also repeats Westcott and Hort’s speculation that the Received Text *“contains conflations [amalgams] of the other text-types.”* That is, it was stitched together from other, competing texts, like those of Aleph and B. Burgon<sup>8, p 44, 113ff</sup> proved over a century ago that *“not a shadow of proof*

*is forthcoming that any such recension [or conflation of the Received Text with other texts] as Dr Hort imagines [and later James White] ever took place at all."*

Of Westcott and Hort's obsession with Aleph and B, (and White's, according to Moorman's assessment of the sources for the modern readings and omissions White condones and often prefers to the AV1611 Text), Burgon states<sup>13, p 300-1</sup>, "*The one aim of those many hazy disquisitions of [Westcott and Hort's] about 'Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probability,' – 'Genealogical evidence, simple and divergent,' – and 'the study of Groups:' – the one reason of all their vague terminology, - and of their baseless theory of 'Conflation,' – and of their disparagement of the Fathers:- the one raison d' être of their fiction of a 'Syrian' and a 'Pre-Syrian' and a 'Neutral' text [or "expansions of piety" or "harmonisation"]<sup>3 p 37-8</sup>:-...All is summed up in the curt formula – Codex B! Behold then the altar at which Copies, Fathers, Versions, are all to be ruthlessly sacrificed: - the tribunal from which there shall be absolutely no appeal: - the Oracle which is to silence every doubt, resolve every riddle, smooth away every difficulty. All has been stated, where the name has been pronounced of – Codex B...Even Patristic evidence of the ante-Nicene period 'requires critical sifting' [Hort] – if it shall be found to contradict Cod. B! 'B very far exceeds all other documents in neutrality [i.e. authenticity] of Text. At a long interval after B, but hardly a less interval before all other MSS., stands Aleph' [Hort]. Such is the sum of the matter!...A coarser, - a clumsier, - a more unscientific, a more stupid expedient for settling the true Text of Scripture was surely never invented!"*

\*\*\*White<sup>3 p 43</sup> alleges that the Alexandrian text "*is found in most papyri*" and therefore represents "*an earlier, and hence more accurate, form of the text than the Byzantine [Received] text-type.*" His assertion is a barefaced lie. The papyri were poor manuscripts and discarded for that reason. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, they frequently agreed with the Received Text more often than with the Alexandrian text, showing that the Alexandrian text did not pre-date the Byzantine<sup>8 p 124ff</sup>.

Wilkinson traces the history of attacks on the AV1611, beginning with this telling observation.

*"When our time-honored Bibles are revised, the changes are generally in favor of Rome."*

See **Appendix**, also this author's work<sup>8 p 210ff</sup>, to verify the accuracy of Wilkinson's conclusion – and the deceitfulness of James White<sup>3 p 5</sup> in urging his readers to accept the alterations introduced to the AV1611 in favour of Rome by modern scholarship, an acceptance that White erroneously terms "**Christian freedom.**" This so-called 'freedom' leads to corrupt modern versions like the NIV, NRSV that agree 80-90% with the Pope (JB) and Watchtower (NWT) in departures from the God-honoured Text of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.

Citing the Catholic Encyclopaedia, Wilkinson describes in the full version of his book<sup>12</sup> how Rome instigated the attack on the AV1611 with one of her priests, Richard Simon<sup>8 p 41</sup>.

*"A French priest, Richard Simon (1683-1712), was the first who subjected the general questions concerning the Bible to a treatment which was at once comprehensive in scope and scientific in method. Simon is the forerunner of modern Biblical criticism... The use of internal evidence by which Simon arrived at it entitles him to be called the father of Biblical criticism."*

Catholic academics, according to Wilkinson, like Astruc and Geddes, sustained their criticisms of the AV1611 until the late eighteenth century, when the attack was joined by

unregenerate German higher critics such as Semler and Griesbach<sup>8 p 121, 149ff, 12 p 268ff</sup>, who influenced later new version editors, such as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, none of whom, in common with their mentors leave any definite testimony of genuine salvation.

They, like Griesbach, arbitrarily rejected the bulk of the manuscript evidence upon which the Received Text and the AV1611 are based and brought forth New Testaments compiled from the corrupt and severely limited texts of Alexandria.

### ***Catholic Allies and the Oxford Movement***

Cardinal Wiseman also strongly influenced these editors. Wilkinson states in his full text.

*“Wiseman lived long enough to exult openly that the King James Version had been thrust aside and the pre-eminence of the Vulgate re-established by the influence of his attacks and those of other textual critics.”*

He adds<sup>12 p 274</sup>.

*“Such were the antecedent conditions preparing the way to draw England into entangling alliances, to de-Protestantize her national church and to advocate at a dangerous hour the necessity of revising the King James Bible.”*

Thanks to modern version editors and their supporters, we live with the results today. See Dr Gipp’s analysis below.

In the full version of his book, Wilkinson sheds light on the significance of the Jesuit-inspired Oxford Movement of the nineteenth century, with its aims of de-Protestantizing the Church of England, urging it back to Rome and displacing the 1611 Authorised Version with a Catholic version of the Vulgate that later became the Revised Version of 1881-4.

Wilkinson describes the success of this movement as follows.

*“Why is it that in 1833, England believed that the Reformation was the work of God, but in 1883 it believed that the Reformation was a rebellion? In 1833, England believed that the Pope was Antichrist; in 1883, that the Pope was the successor of the apostles. And further, in 1833, any clergyman who would have used Mass, confession, holy water, etc., in the Church of England, would have been immediately dismissed, if he would not have undergone violent treatment at the hands of the people. In 1883, thousands of Masses, confessions, and other ritualistic practices of Romanism were carried on in services held in the Church of England. The historian Froude says:*

*““In my first term at the University (Oxford), the controversial fires were beginning to blaze... I had learnt, like other Protestant children, that the Pope was Antichrist, and that Gregory VII had been a special revelation of that being. I was now taught that Gregory VII was a saint. I had been told to honor the Reformers. The Reformation became a great schism, Cranmer a traitor and Latimer a vulgar ranter. Milton was a name of horror.””*

Wilkinson then explains.

*“The attitude of Roman Catholics to the King James Version has ever been one of bitter hostility. The Catholic Bishop of Erie, Pa., calls it that “vile”\* Protestant Version. This attitude is further evinced through the feelings expressed by two eminent characters connected with the Oxford Movement; one who critically described the Authorized Version before revision was accomplished; the other, after revision was well under way.”*



\*As did Hort, with respect to the Textus Receptus underlying the AV1611<sup>8 p 42 12 p 290-291</sup>.  
Birds of a feather...

*“Dr. Faber, the brilliant associate of Newman, and a passionate Romanizer, called the King James Version, “that stronghold of heresy in England;” and when revision began to appear as almost certain, Cardinal Wiseman expressed himself in these words:*

*““When we consider the scorn cast by the Reformers upon the Vulgate, and their recurrence, in consequence, to the Greek, as the only accurate standard, we cannot but rejoice at the silent triumph which truth has at length gained over clamorous error. For, in fact, the principal writers who have avenged the Vulgate, and obtained for it its critical pre-eminence are Protestants [within the Church of England].”*

*“The famous Tract 90 did not leave this question untouched. Though Cardinal Newman argued strongly for the orthodox Catholic position, that tradition is of equal, if not superior authority to the Bible, nevertheless, he put a divine stamp on the Vulgate and a human stamp upon the Authorized Version. These are his words:*

*““A further question may be asked, concerning our Received Version of the Scriptures [AV1611], whether it is in any sense imposed on us as a true comment on the original text; as the Vulgate is upon the Roman Catholics. It would appear not. It was made and authorized by royal commands, which cannot be supposed to have any claim upon our interior consent.””*

*“Furthermore, in the Dublin Review (June 1883), Newman says that the Authorized Version “is notoriously unfair where doctrinal questions are at stake,” and speaks of its “dishonest renderings.” This shows the Catholic attitude of mind toward the King James Version.”*

Newman’s “interior consent” appears similar to White’s notions<sup>3 p 5, 95</sup> of “Christian freedom” and “individual responsibility.” White is clearly no more of a bible believer than Newman. He too accuses the AV1611 of dishonesty<sup>3 p 142</sup>, insisting that the word “**honest**” as found in 2 Corinthians 8:21, Philippians 4:8 and 1 Peter 2:12 should be altered to “honourable” or “excellent” as in the NASV.

Naturally, White overlooked the first mention of the word in Luke 8:15 and how it is contrasted with “**deceitfulness**” in the parallel passages in Matthew 13:22 and Mark 4:19. He is not a particularly careful student of the scriptures.

Wilkinson describes how Newman became obsessed with “securing endorsement for those Catholic readings of the accepted books which had been rejected by the Reformers” and states that “Revision became the inevitable outcome of the Oxford Movement...And we are told that so strong were the efforts on the Revision Committee to revise different passages of the New Testament in favor of Rome, that on one occasion the Dean of Rochester remarked that it was time they raised a cry of “No Popery.””

All of which demonstrates once again that White is wholly disingenuous when he postulates that no conspiracy underlies the modern versions<sup>3 p iv etc – see earlier</sup> and that modern scholars whose works have continued in the tradition of the 1881 revisers<sup>8 p 289ff</sup> have no “malevolent intent” and can therefore be trusted<sup>3 p 130ff</sup>. Quite clearly, they can’t.

Wilkinson’s next chapter<sup>12 p 277ff</sup> focuses on Cambridge academics, Drs Westcott and Hort, prime movers of the 1881 Revision underlying most modern versions – for England’s other premier institute of learning had also suffered Jesuit infiltration<sup>12 p 284</sup>. He describes their higher (i.e. Germanic) criticism, their Mariolatry, their anti-Protestantism, their tendency to evolution, their ritualism (sacramentalism), their doctrine of papal

atonement (i.e. the Catholic Mass) and their collusion in secret prior to the Revision, in 1870.

A conspiracy of the first magnitude was thus being hatched, bristling with “*malevolent intent.*” Wilkinson quotes Hort as follows.

“*“The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove [i.e. AV1611 readings to be replaced by the RV], can surely be more wholesomely and also more effectually reached by individual efforts of an indirect kind than by combined open assault. At present very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted on by influences which will assuredly bear good fruit in due time, if the process is allowed to go on quietly; and I cannot help fearing that a premature crisis would frighten back many into the merest traditionalism [i.e. belief in the AV1611 as the pure word of God].”*”

Wilkinson deals extensively with the outworking of this conspiracy and shows that it was indeed ultimately a satanically inspired attack via the Jesuits of Rome against the Book of God. Wilkinson thus further disposes of another of White’s postulates, namely that the AV1611 was a mere work of men, one that he contemptuously dismisses<sup>3 p 82</sup> as “*a monument to those who labored to bring it into existence...[via] a human process, and as in all of human life and endeavour, it did not partake of infallibility.*”

How unlike the words of Dr Miles Smith, of the Oxford Group of 1611 translators<sup>25 p 184</sup>, who wrote the Preface to the 1611 Holy Bible<sup>26 p 26-27</sup>.

“*Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, (Genesis 26:15) neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews (Jeremiah 2:13). Others have labored, and ye may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...neither yet with Esau sell your birthright for a mess of pottage (Hebrews 12:16).*”

Naturally, White ignored all of Dr Smith’s warnings. Wilkinson, by contrast, describes<sup>12 p 284ff</sup> how the 1881 Revisers set the pattern for modern version committees as latter-day “*dogs to tear and abuse holy things*” in order to supplant “*fountains of living water*” with their papal “*mess of pottage.*”

“*For years there had been a determined and aggressive campaign to take extensive liberties with the Received Text; and the Romanizing Movement in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, both ritualistic and critical, had made it easy for hostile investigators to speak out with impunity.*”

### ***The Revision Conspiracy***

Concerning the Revisers’ hostility to the Received Text, Wilkinson states that twice they had petitioned the Crown to appoint a royal commission for the purpose of the Revision. The Crown refused. This double refusal shows that *all* the modern versions from the RV onwards are not of God, because they were not sanctioned by a king, unlike the AV1611, which was. The modern versions therefore have no power with God.

“***Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?***” Ecclesiastes 8:4. “***The king’s word***” is the final authority, 2 Samuel 24:4. It is now vested in the AV1611. The Revisers tried to usurp this God-ordained authority.

As Wilkinson states of the then leaders of the campaign for revision of the AV1611,

*“Dr. Moulton [a member of the Revision Committee and instrumental in selecting its members] looked upon the Vulgate as a witness superior to the King James, and upon the Greek manuscripts which formed the base of the Vulgate as superior to the Greek manuscripts which formed the base of the King James. Furthermore, he said, speaking of the Jesuit New Testament of 1582, “The Rhemish Testament agrees with the best critical editions of the present day.” Dr. Moulton, therefore, not only believed the manuscripts which were recently discovered to be similar to the Greek manuscripts from which the Vulgate was translated, but he also looked upon the Greek New Testaments of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, built largely upon the same few manuscripts, as “the best critical editions.” Since he exercised so large an influence in selecting the other members of the Committee, we can divine at the outset the attitude of mind which would likely prevail in the Revision Committee.”*

Wilkinson elaborates as follows, noting the stark contrast between the openness of the 1611 translation work and that of the Revisers.

*“When the English New Testament Committee met, it was immediately apparent what was going to happen. Though for ten long years the iron rule of silence kept the public ignorant of what was going on behind closed doors, the story is now known. The first meeting of the Committee found itself a divided body, the majority being determined to incorporate into the proposed revision the latest and most extreme higher criticism. This majority was dominated and carried along by a triumvirate consisting of Hort, Westcott, and Lightfoot. The dominating mentality of this triumvirate was Dr. Hort who with Westcott had worked together before this for twenty years, in bringing out a Greek New Testament constructed on principles which deviated the farthest ever yet known from the Received Text. [Westcott and Hort] came prepared to effect a systematic change in the Protestant Bible.”*

As Hort made plain. Wilkinson again.

*“As early as 1851, before Westcott and Hort began their twenty years labor on their Greek text, Hort wrote, “Think of that vile Textus Receptus.” In 1851, when he knew little of the Greek New Testament, or of texts, he was dominated with the idea that the Received Text was “vile” and “villainous.” The Received Text suffered fatal treatment at the hands of this master in debate.”*

Note that the Revision Committee was subject to rules that insisted on as little change as possible to the Text of the 1611 Authorised Version but Wilkinson makes clear that Westcott and Hort *“were determined at the outset to be greater than the rules, and to manipulate them.”*

By their dominance of the committee, Westcott and Hort were able to include on it a Unitarian, Dr G. Vance Smith. It is therefore easy to understand the outcome of the committee’s proceedings, as Wilkinson shows.

*“The minority in the Committee was represented principally by Dr. Scrivener, probably the foremost scholar of the day in the manuscripts of the Greek New Testament and the history of the Text. If we may believe the words of Chairman Ellicott, the countless divisions in the Committee over the Greek Text, “was often a kind of critical duel between Dr. Hort and Dr. Scrivener.” Dr. Scrivener was continuously and systematically outvoted.”*

Thus the words of God are decided by majority vote, perhaps an expression of *“individual responsibility,”* to cite James White<sup>3 p 95</sup>.

The results of the voting related back to Hort's obsession with the corrupt Codex B, Vaticanus, as Wilkinson shows.

*"The new Greek Testament upon which Westcott and Hort had been working for twenty years was, portion by portion, secretly committed into the hands of the Revision Committee. Their Greek Text was strongly radical and revolutionary. The Revisers followed the guidance of the two Cambridge editors, Westcott and Hort, who were constantly at their elbow, and whose radical Greek New Testament, deviating the farthest possible from the Received Text, is to all intents and purposes the Greek New Testament followed by the Revision Committee. And this Greek text, in the main, follows the Vatican and Sinaiticus manuscripts..."*

*"Hort's partiality for the Vatican Manuscript was practically absolute.*

*"We can almost hear him say, The Vaticanus have I loved, but the Textus Receptus have I hated. As the Sinaiticus was the brother of the Vaticanus, wherever pages in the latter were missing, Hort used the former. He and Westcott considered that when the consensus of opinion of these two manuscripts favored a reading, that reading should be accepted as apostolic. This attitude of mind involved thousands of changes in our time-honored Greek New Testament because a Greek text formed upon the united opinion of Codex B and Codex Aleph would be different in thousands of places from the Received Text. So the Revisers "went on changing until they had altered the Greek Text in 5337 places.""*

36,000 changes were made in total, with according to Canon Cook, *"The Vatican Codex...sometimes alone, generally in accord with the Sinaitic, is responsible for nine-tenths of the most striking innovations in the Revised Version."*

Those are changes perpetuated in the modern versions; e.g. NIV, NRSV and NKJV in the footnotes. See **Appendix, Tables A5-A8**, showing that the NIV, NRSV agree with the RV 84% against the AV1611. Hardly a balanced approach, on the part of modern editors.

Moorman has shown how Codices Aleph and B repeatedly are the sources for the departures from the AV1611 that the Revisers adopted and were later reproduced in modern versions like the NIV and NRSV<sup>9 p 61ff</sup> - this author has listed 86 verses with important doctrinal implications that show how the RV and NIV repeatedly agree together against the AV1611<sup>8 p 258ff</sup>. At least 60 of these verses reveal agreement between the DR, RV and NIV. Although the **Appendix** suggests that overall agreement between the JR, DR and the NIV against the AV1611 may be less than 30-40% (still a sizable proportion) for the whole of the New Testament they appear to match repeatedly where important doctrinal passages are encountered.

And it must always be remembered that Westcott and Hort's main sources, Codices Aleph and B were wholly untrustworthy. See remarks earlier on their corrupt contents.

Burgon demonstrated the inconsistency between the old uncial manuscripts underlying the Greek text of Westcott and Hort and subsequently the modern versions<sup>8 p 117-118, 13 p 30-31</sup>. Note that the first citation is originally from Burgon's *The Traditional Text*, p 84, of which Donald Waite has provided a summary<sup>10</sup>.

*"The five Old Uncials' (Aleph A B C D) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text; and yet they are never able to agree among themselves as to one single various reading: while only once are more than two of them observed to stand together, and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of an article. Such is their eccentric ten-*

*dency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence.”*

Mark 2:1-12 is another example:

*“In the course of those 12 verses...there will be found to be 60 variations of reading...Now, in the present instance, the ‘five old uncials’ CANNOT BE the depositories of a tradition, - whether Western or Eastern, - because they render inconsistent testimony IN EVERY VERSE. It must further be admitted, (for this is really not a question of opinion, but a plain matter of fact,) that it is unreasonable to place confidence in such documents. What would be the thought in a Court of Law of five witnesses, called up 47 times for examination, who should be observed to bear contradictory testimony EVERY TIME?”*

Burgon also affirmed the contrast between Westcott and Hort’s sources and the Traditional Text underlying the 1611 Authorised Bible. See Burgon’s comments earlier about 995 manuscripts out of every thousand and Waite’s accompanying assessment<sup>10</sup>.

*“We have, in our day, over 99% of the evidence of our manuscripts favoring the type of text that underlies our King James Bible. Some 5,210 of the 5,255 of our manuscripts favor the Traditional Text that underlies our King James Bible. Less than 1% of the manuscripts side with the false texts of Westcott and Hort and their modern counterparts, the Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Societies [and the NIV, NRSV]. The Westcott and Hort people despise this test of truth because the number of manuscripts on their side is so small.”*

White therefore resorts to his phantasmagoric notions of “expansions of piety” in the AV1611. See above.

Though even Hort was forced to acknowledge that<sup>12 p 294</sup> *“the Received Text, by his own admission, had for 1400 years been the dominant Greek New Testament.”*

Surely the strongest possible evidence of God’s providential preservation of His words, culminating in the publication of the 1611 Authorised Bible – though not, of course, to those who, like **“Jannes and Jambres...resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith”** 2 Timothy 3:8. Also like James White.

In the end, Wilkinson<sup>12 p 298ff</sup> describes the Revisers as *“wreckers not builders.”*

*“Ever since the Revised Version was printed, it has met with strong opposition. Its devotees reply that the King James met opposition when it was first published. There is a vast difference, however. Only one name of prominence can be cited as an opponent of the King James Version at its birth [Hebraist Hugh Broughton<sup>8 p 238-9</sup>]. The King, all the church of England, in fact, all the Protestant world was for it. On the other hand, royal authority twice refused to associate itself with the project of revision, as also did the northern half of the Church of England, the Episcopal Church of North America, besides a host of students and scholars of authority.*

*“When God has taught us that “all Scripture is given by Inspiration” of the Holy Spirit and that “men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” the Holy Spirit must be credited with ability to transmit and preserve inviolate the Sacred Deposit. We cannot admit for a moment that the Received Text which, by the admission of its enemies themselves, has led the true people of God for centuries, can be whipped into fragments and set aside for a manuscript found in an out-of-the-way monastery, and for another of the same family, which has lain, for man knows not how long, upon a shelf in the library of the Pope’s palace. Both these documents are of uncertain ancestry, of questionable history, and of suspicious character. The Received Text was put for centuries in its position*

*of leadership by divine Providence, just as truly as the star of Bethlehem was set in the heavens to guide the wise men. Neither was it the product of certain technical rules of textual criticism which some men have chosen the last few decades to exalt as divine principle.”*

Wilkinson thus provides more evidence that the AV1611 was indeed of God as the ultimate refinement of His word and not, as James White insists<sup>3 p 82</sup>, the flawed outcome of a mere “*human process.*”

As Dr Vance shows, the AV1611 completes the refining process that Psalm 12:6, 7 describes.

***“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.”***

White’s shallow objections<sup>3 p 243</sup> to this conclusion will be discussed subsequently. Dr Ruckman and Dr Vance<sup>27</sup> have shown how this verse was fulfilled by means of:

- A received Hebrew text, 1800 BC to 389 BC
- A received Aramaic text at the same time (Genesis, Daniel, etc.)
- A received Greek text from AD 40 to AD 90
- A received Syrian text from AD 120 to AD 200
- A received Latin text from AD 150 to AD 1500
- A received German text from AD 1500 to AD 2006
- A received English text from AD 1611 to AD 2006

Dr Vance then lists the fulfilment of Psalm 12:6 in English, derived from *The Rules to be Observed in the Translation of the Bible*, Rules 1 and 14:

- Tyndale’s Bible (15250)
- Coverdale’s Bible (1535)
- Matthew’s Bible (1537)
- The Great Bible (1539)
- The Bishops’ Bible (1568)
- The Geneva Bible (1582)
- The King James 1611 Authorised Version

Apart from minor refinements in subsequent editions, God’s refining process was complete with the publication of the AV1611.

Comparing that refining process to the wrecking process of the Revisers, Wilkinson states.

*“When a company of men set out faithfully to translate genuine manuscripts in order to convey what God said, it is one thing. When a committee sets itself to revise or translate with ideas and a “scheme,” it is another thing. But it may be objected that the translators of the King James were biased by their pro-Protestant views. The reader must judge whose bias he will accept, that of the influence of the Protestant Reformation, as heading up in the Authorized Version, or that of the influence of Darwinism, higher criticism, incipient modern religious liberalism, and a reversion back to Rome, as heading up in the*

*Revised Version. If we select the latter bias, we must remember that both higher criticism and Romanism reject the authority of the Bible as supreme.”*

As does James White. His condescending references<sup>3 p iv, vii</sup> to “*a seventeenth-century Anglican...great, yet imperfect translation of the Bible,*” with the term “*Bible*” unspecified by him anywhere in his book as any volume between two covers, indicates that he is no different in his attitude to the Holy Bible than an unregenerate German ‘higher critic’ like Griesbach or a subversive, Romanising reviser like Westcott, Newman and Hort.

See again, **Appendix, Table A5** for the many references that reveal popular modern versions like the NIV and NRSV to be merely rehashed Westcott and Hort, i.e. RV, often supported by the Jesuit and Douay-Rheims versions. The results show that the NIV, NRSV agree with the JR, DR, RV 41% against the AV1611 and 84% with the RV against the AV1611.

Although equivalent figures have not been generated for the NKJV, it should be noted that the footnoted readings in this version<sup>8 p 55ff</sup> usually support the NIV (and therefore NRSV) text and according to the editors<sup>28</sup> constitute “*a clearly defined presentation of the variants...for the benefit of interested readers representing all textual persuasions.*”

In other words, the NKJV is as ‘Catholic’ as its contemporaries and would give anti-biblical papists as much satisfaction as the Catholic RV of Westcott and Hort.

As Wilkinson states in the full version of his work, citing Dr Edgar.

### ***Rome Rejoices at Revision***

“*It is certainly a remarkable circumstance that so many of the Catholic readings in the New Testament, which in Reformation and early post-Reformation times were denounced by Protestants as corruptions of the pure text of God’s Word, should now, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century\*, be adopted by the Revisers of our time-honored English Bibles.*”

\*And the twentieth.

Wilkinson provides abundant testimony to show that Catholic priests were pleased with the RV readings. For example.

*“A Catholic priest says that the Revised Version confirms readings of the Catholic Version:*

*“From the Very Revelation Thomas S. Preston, of St. Ann’s (R. C.) Church of New York, — “The brief examination which I have been able to make of the Revised Version of the New Testament has convinced me that the Committee have labored with great sincerity and diligence, and that they have produced a translation much more correct than that generally received among Protestants.*

*““It is to us a gratification to find that in very many instances they have adopted the reading of the Catholic Version, and have thus by their scholarship confirmed the correctness of our Bible.””*

*“Our [RC] Bible”* being one that James White repeatedly endorses, as will be shown – see also **Appendix, Table A1**. Wilkinson continues.

*“A Catholic Bishop [Mullen, Canon of the Old Testament] considers that the Revised Version is like the Douay Bible:*

*““And there is no reason to doubt that, had King James’ translators generally followed the Douay Version, the convocation of Canterbury would have been saved the trouble of*

*inaugurating a movement for the purpose of expurgating the English Protestant Bible of the errors and corruptions by which its pages are filled.”*”

And James White would not have needed to write his book.

Wilkinson again.

*“French and German Catholic authorities approve the critical features of the Greek text which underlies the Revised Version:*

*“In the Bulletin Critique of Paris for Jan. 15, 1881, the learned Louis Duchesne opens the review of Westcott and Hort with these words: ‘Voici un livre destine a faire epoche dans la critique du Nouveau-Testament.’ (Here is a book destined to create a new epoch in New Testament criticism.) To this Catholic testimony from France may be added German Catholic approval, since Dr. Hundhausen, of Mainz, in the ‘Literarischer Handweiser,’ 1882, No. 19, col. 590, declares:*

*“‘Unter allen bisher auf dem Gebiete der neutestamentlichen Textkritik erschienenen Werken gebuhrt dem Westcott-Hort-schen unstreitig die Palme.’ (Among all printed works which have appeared in the field of New Testament textual criticism, the palm belongs unquestionably to the Westcott-Hort Text.)”*

And what of the consequences of substituting the AV1611 for its Catholic counterparts?

#### ***Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath***

Unlike White, who attempts without substantiation to charge bible believers with spreading<sup>3 p iv</sup> *“disruption and contention,”* Wilkinson describes the ‘fruits’ of *“confusion and doubt”* that accompany the new ‘bibles’<sup>12 p 304ff</sup> following rejection of the AV1611 Text by the undoubtedly influential *“Romanizing portion of the Church of England”* that included Drs Westcott and Hort, the main architects of the RV. Westcott and Hort were themselves *“great admirers of Newman”*<sup>12 p 308</sup>.

*“Because of the changes which came about in the nineteenth century, there arose a new type of Protestantism and a new version of the Protestant Bible. This new kind of Protestantism was hostile to the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation. Previous to this there had been only two types of Bibles in the world, the Protestant and the Catholic. Now Protestants were asked to choose between the true Protestant Bible and one which reproduced readings rejected by the Reformers...”*

*“This new Protestantism captured most of the Church of England, permeated other Protestant denominations in Great Britain, and flooded the theological seminaries of America. One college professor, alarmed at the atmosphere of paganism which had come into American universities and denominational colleges, investigated them and reported that “ninety percent or more teach a false religion as well as a false science and a false philosophy.”*

*“False science teaches the origin of the universe by organic development without God, and calls it evolution. German philosophy early taught the development of humanity through the self-evolution of the absolute spirit\*. The outstanding advocates of this latter philosophy, Schelling and Hegel, were admitted pantheists...”*

\*Or as the unregenerate, hell bound and late Roman Catholic bible-rejecter, Frank Sinatra declared<sup>29</sup>, in a piece of diabolical duplicity that became a chart-topping sensation:

*“And now, the end is near, and so I face, the final curtain.*

*“My friend, I’ll say it clear,*



*"I'll state my case, of which I'm certain.  
 "I've lived, a life that's full, I've travelled each and every highway.  
 "And more, much more than this, I did it my way."*

Wilkinson was a visionary. The scripture's comment on Sinatra's heathen deception emanating from German philosophy and rejection of the true Bible is clear:

***"All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all"*** Isaiah 53:6.

Concerning evolution, stemming from false science and rejection of the true Bible, Scott M. Huse<sup>30 p 124</sup> states:

*"The fruit of evolution has been all sorts of anti-Christian systems of beliefs and practice. It has served as an intellectual basis for Hitler's nazism and Marx's communism. It has promoted apostasy, atheism, secular humanism, and libertinism\* as well as establishing a basis for ethical relativism, which has spread through our society like a cancer. The mind and general welfare of mankind has suffered greatly as a result of this naturalistic philosophy."*

\*Again, see Sinatra above.

And as Dr Gipp states<sup>31 p 113</sup> on the fruits of false science and rejection of the true Bible:

*"Today's modern translations haven't been able to spark a revival in a Christian school, let alone be expected to close a bar. In fact, since the arrival of our modern English translations, beginning with the ASV of 1901, America has seen:*

1. *God and prayer kicked out of our public school.*
2. *Abortion on demand legalised.*
3. *Homosexuality accepted nationally as an "alternate life style".*
4. *In home pornography via TV and VCR.*
5. *Child kidnapping and pornography running rampant.*
6. *Dope has become an epidemic.*
7. *Satanism is on the rise.*

*"If this is considered a "revival" then let's turn back to the King James to STOP it."*

James White is as dismissive of Dr Gipp's efforts in support of the AV1611 as he is of those of Gail Riplinger but he avoids taking issue with Dr Gipp's conclusions above.

Wilkinson continues:

*"The new [pantheistic] theology changed the Protestant conception of Christ; then very naturally it changed all the fundamental doctrines and consequently made the Bible secondary as the fountain of faith, while nominally giving to the Bible its customary usages. However, like the Gnostics of old, this new theology would not scruple to change passages to support their theology."*

Note that this Gnostic 'pantheism' is in harmony with Newman's notion of hosts of intermediate spiritual beings, Romanist 'saints' and New Age avatars. See comments earlier.

White persistently neglects to mention the Romanising nature of the departures of the modern versions, RV, NIV, NRSV, NKJV footnote(s) f.n., from the AV1611. The **Appendix** shows that the older Catholic bibles like the Douay-Rheims retained various AV1611 readings but inspection of Moorman's treatises<sup>9</sup> will confirm that the Catholic

manuscripts, Codices Aleph and B, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, are repeatedly the main sources of the progressive modern alterations and omissions, away from the God-honoured Text of the 1611.

Wilkinson states, with respect to these corrupt sources.

*“Why was it that at so late a date as 1870 the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts were brought forth and exalted to a place of supreme dictatorship in the work of revising the King James Bible? Especially when shocking corruptions of these documents betray a “systematic depravation”? On this Dean Burgon says: “The impurity of the texts exhibited by Codices B and Aleph is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of fact. These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence... Codices B and Aleph are, demonstrably, nothing else but specimens of the depraved class thus characterized.”*

*“Dr. Salmon declares that Burgon “had probably handled and collated very many more MSS, than either Westcott or Hort” and “was well entitled to rank as an expert.” Nevertheless, there has been a widespread effort to belittle Dean Burgon in his unanswerable indictment of the work of Revision. All assailants of the Received Text or their sympathizers feel so keenly the powerful exposures made by Dean Burgon that generally they labor to minimize his arguments.”*

‘Our critic,’ an academic of over twenty years’ experience of teaching New Testament Greek, was in this category<sup>8 p 289</sup> and like others of his ilk, “dismissed Burgon peremptorily.” Hardly a ‘scholarly’ approach! Wilkinson continues.

*“Concerning the depravations of Codex Aleph, we have the further testimony of Dr. Scrivener. In 1864 he published “A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus.” In the Introductions he makes it clear that this document was corrected by ten different scribes “at different periods.” He tells of “the occurrence of so many different styles of handwriting, apparently due to penmen removed from each other by centuries, which deform by their corrections every page of this venerable-looking document.” Codex Aleph is “covered with such alterations, brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page.””*

Prompting from Wilkinson a searching question.

*“Why should ten different scribes, through the centuries have spread their corrections systematically over every page of...Sinaiticus? Evidently no owner of so costly a document would have permitted such disfigurements unless he considered the original Greek was not genuine and needed correcting.”*

Wilkinson’s observation heralds the modern practice of ‘do-it-yourself’ bibles, to which White confesses when he describes<sup>3 p 26</sup> certain NIV readings as “*too interpretive for my tastes.*” But two pages earlier, he supports the NIV’s rendering of Luke 9:44 *against* the AV1611. Elsewhere<sup>3 p 94-5</sup>, he urges the exercise of “*individual responsibility,*” to God “*for our beliefs and our actions*” and insists that “*a man is responsible to learn God’s Word as best he can, and to follow what he learns.*” White also mentions “*the Bible*” in this context but once again does not specify *which* Bible it is. Nor does he care to enlighten the reader with a definition of “*God’s Word*” that “*a man is responsible to learn...as best he can...*”

Then he makes the outrageous statement<sup>3 p 161</sup> that “*Scripture [a selection of modern versions in this instance, including the NIV] records Jesus’ call to take up the cross in three places and this is sufficient.*”

White here dictates to the Lord Himself what should or should not be included in the expression ***“all scripture is given by inspiration of God”*** 2 Timothy 3:16. It is difficult to imagine greater arrogance than this, unless it is Pope Boniface VIII’s declaration<sup>32</sup> *“What therefore can you make of me but God?”*

Yet Boniface VIII’s declaration is only marginally more arrogant than that of James White, who has clearly taken it upon *himself* to construct *“the [DIY] Bible”* as the above examples reveal.

(White has actually confused the expression ***“take up his cross”*** Matthew 16:24, Mark 8:34, Luke 9:23 with ***“take up the cross”*** Mark 10:21, which the NIV omits, along with the JR, DR, JB, NWT. See ***Appendix, Table A1***. Moorman<sup>9 p 80</sup> shows that evidence in favour of the AV1611 reading is overwhelming and comments, *“There has always been an attempt to take the cross out of discipleship.”*)

### ***A Serious Warning***

Wilkinson has a serious warning for White and other self-made bible manufacturers<sup>12 p 310-11</sup>.

*“When Doctors Westcott and Hort called “vile” and “villainous” the Received Text which, by the providence of God, was accounted an authority for 1800 years, they opened wide the door for individual and religious sects to bring forth new Bibles, solely upon their own authority...*

*“Will not God hold us responsible for light and knowledge concerning His Word? Can we escape His condemnation, if we choose to exalt any version containing proved corruptions? Shall we not rather, avoid putting these versions on a level with God’s true Bible?..*

*“Uniformity in expressing the sacred language of the one God is highly essential. It would be confusion, not order, if we did not maintain uniformity of Bible language in our church services, in our colleges and in the memory work of our children. “For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints” 1 Corinthians 14:33. It is not those who truly love the Word of God, who wish to multiply various versions, which they design shall be authorized for congregational use or exalted as authority for doctrine... let us have a uniform standard version.”*

An eminently sensible request. One pathetic result of ignoring it is the impossibility now, in many churches, of the venerable and edifying practice of responsive reading, in full accord with Paul’s exhortation.

***“Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord”*** Colossians 3:16.

White is unable to produce any *“uniform standard version”* that would fulfil Paul’s exhortation but on page v, continuing to chip away at the efficacy of the Authorised Version, White insists that, *“men and women led fine Christian lives for fifteen hundred years before the KJV came on the scene.”*

Wilkinson answers this distortion as follows, in the conclusion to his work, emphasising again how the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible was indeed the work of God, not that of man.

*“Eating the bread of poverty and dressed in the garments of penury, the church in the wilderness followed on to serve the Lord. She possessed the untampered manuscripts of holy revelation which discountenanced the claims of the Papacy. Among this little flock,*

*stood out prominently the Waldenses. Generation after generation of skilled copyists handed down, unadulterated, the pure Word. Repeatedly their glorious truth spread far among the nations. In terror, the Papacy thundered at the monarchs of Europe to stamp out this heresy by the sword of steel. In vain the popish battalions drenched the plains of Europe with martyr blood. The word lived, unconquered.”*

In other words, the pre-1611 men and women of God laboured, suffered and not infrequently died martyrs’ deaths to lay the foundations for God’s Book that was to come, a resounding fact of history that White has neither the grace nor the discernment to acknowledge. Wilkinson continues.

*“The pathetic question of Pilate, “What is Truth,” is not more pathetic than the error of those who say that only by balancing one version against another, or by examining the various manuscript readings, — those of apostates as well as those of the faithful, — can we arrive at approximate truth [see White’s<sup>3 p 7</sup> recommendation for the purchase of “multiple translations of the Bible”]...*

*“The Authorized Version was translated in 1611, just before the Puritans departed from England, so that they carried it with them across stormy seas to lay the foundation of one of the greatest governments the world has ever known. The Authorized Version of God’s Holy Word had much to do with the laying of the foundation of our great country.*

*“When the Bible was translated in 1611, God foresaw the wide extended use of the English language; and, therefore, in our Authorized Bible, gave the best translation that has ever been made, not only in the English language, but as many scholars say, ever made in any language.*

*“...[But] when apostasy had cast its dark shadow over the Western lands of opportunity, God raised up the men of 1611. They were true Protestants. Many of their friends and associates had already fallen before the sword of despotism while witnessing for the Holy Word. And in a marvellous way God worked to give us through them an English version from the genuine manuscripts. It grew and soon exercised a mighty influence upon the whole world. But this was an offence to the old systems of the past.”*

And, it seems, to James White, who is keen not only to compile his own ‘bible’ by means of the balancing act Wilkinson refers to above but also to justify the kind of subversion that Wilkinson describes as follows.

*“Then arose the pantheistic theology of Germany, the ritualistic Oxford Movement of England, and the Romanizing Mercersburg theology of America. Through the leaders, or associates of the leaders, in these movements, revised versions were brought forth which raised again to influence manuscripts and versions long discarded by the more simple, more democratic bodies of Christianity, because of the bewildering confusion which their uncertain message produced. Again the people of God are called upon to face this subtle and insidious program.”*

### ***The 1611 Authorised Holy Bible - Undefeated***

As now but the AV1611 continues on undefeated. Wilkinson continues.

*“Nevertheless, in a remarkable way, God has honored the King James Version. It is the Bible of the 160,000,000 English-speaking people [in the 1930s], whose tongue is spoken by more of the human race than any other. German and Russian are each the languages of 100,000,000; while French is spoken by 70,000,000. The King James Version has been translated into many other languages. One writer claims 886.*

*“It is the Book of the human race.*

*“It is the author of vastly more missionary enterprises than any other version.*

*“It is God’s missionary Book.”*

### ***White’s Main Postulates Refuted***

Inspection of Wilkinson’s and related research thus far disposes of four of White’s main postulates that are evident in his book - even if not listed explicitly. The research has shown that:

- Rome was fully behind a conspiracy to subvert the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible. It continues to this day.
- The Greek manuscripts underlying the modern versions, RV, NIV, NRSV, NKJV margins or footnote(s) f.n. (and even its text in translation with respect to Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30 on the Lord’s Deity<sup>8 p 77, 182ff</sup> – see also Ruckman<sup>33 p 7</sup> on 2 Corinthians 2:17, 1 Timothy 6:10, 2 Timothy 2:15 as mistranslated by the NKJV) have been deliberately and repeatedly corrupted. Contrary to White’s unproven assertions<sup>3 p 43, 46, 153, 177</sup> about “*expansions of piety*” and careless copying of the Received Text manuscripts, even the arch-reviser Dr Hort was forced to acknowledge the relative uniformity of the manuscripts underlying the AV1611, in spite of their widely differing sources.
- Modern scholarship, deriving from unregenerate German higher critics, Catholic priests and apostate Anglican clergy is *not* trustworthy.
- The AV1611 is “*God’s missionary book,*” brought about by God’s intervention in human history and as such it is the pure word of God<sup>34</sup> “*without admixture or error.*” It is not a mere manmade attempt at bible translation from uncertain and contradictory sources such as those that underlie the modern versions.

At this point, it is well to review some of the sweeping insinuations that White makes in his *Introduction*.

*“The KJV Only controversy feeds upon the ignorance among Christians regarding the origin, transmission and translation of the [unspecified] Bible”<sup>3 p v</sup>.*

White’s assertion is a lie, especially insofar as he includes Dr Otis Fuller’s book *Which Bible?* in his bibliography, containing Dr Wilkinson’s comprehensive treatise on the history of the true scriptures, culminating in the AV1611 and the counterfeit versions of Rome. Moreover, Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 180</sup> recommends a page of sources to study “*regarding the origin, transmission and translation of the Bible,*” including commentators, several Greek editions and lexicons, textual critics and the 1611 Holy Bible itself, versus a variety of modern versions.

*“This book is written because of a desire for peace in the church of Jesus Christ...a peace that comes from single minded devotion to the things of God”<sup>3 p vi</sup>.*

Observe that White’s book was not written for the sake of “*righteousness*” or “*purity*” or “*devotion to the words of God, or Jesus Christ, or God Himself*”<sup>1 p 307-8</sup>. And it was not written to determine any ‘final authority in matters of faith and conduct.’ What are “*the things of God*”? White does not say. His book is a smokescreen.

*“This book is not written to push one particular translation of the [unspecified] Bible over another. There is no desire to get everyone to read the NASB, or the NIV, or the*

*NKJV, or the RSV, or any other “modern” translation. On the other hand...This book is not against the King James Version”*<sup>3 p vi</sup>.

But it is, in nearly all of the 241 passages of scripture where White compares the AV1611 with other versions. His comments on these passages indicate that *any* version is ‘preferable,’ provided it conflicts with the AV1611, e.g. on Matthew 1:25, 8:29, 20:16, 25:13, 27:35, Mark 6:11, 10:21, Colossians 1:14<sup>3 p 156ff</sup>. In all these passages, the AV1611 is alleged to be at fault for adding to the words of God, via *parallel influence* - for which White can produce no evidence whatsoever - and therefore its readings should be rejected in favour of any of the modern alternatives.

Inspection of Moorman’s work<sup>9</sup> shows that White is lying again.

*“The author of this work is a biblical conservative...there are a number of Bible translations that I would not personally recommend”*<sup>3 p vii</sup>.

See remarks in the **Introduction** on White’s “*biblical conservatism*” and note Dr Ruckman’s observation that White does not dare specify even one version that he would not recommend. The **Appendix** shows why – it would be too easy to compare their texts with those of the modern versions that White uses to overthrow the AV1611; NIV, NASV, NKJV, NRSV etc.

*“I encourage the thinking that is marked by wisdom...that examines the facts and holds to the highest standard of truth. Christians should not engage in circular reasoning and unfair argumentation”*<sup>3 p vii</sup>.

So why didn’t White examine any of the detailed facts that Wilkinson put forth, to show that the AV1611 is ‘the standard’? Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 228</sup> points out that, in addition to not defining his “*highest standard of truth,*” White<sup>3 p 95, 128</sup> then alters it to “*highest standards thereof,*” plural, then shifts his ground again, from “*exact same standards,*” (by which to judge the KJV), to “*Our standard*” which turns out not to be a ‘standard’ at all.

It turns out to be an unanswered question. “*What did the original author of scripture say at this point?*”

But as Dr Ruckman rightly says<sup>1 p 24, 227</sup>, “*No question can be a “standard”.*” Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 22-27</sup> actually lists no fewer than ten ‘standards’ that White attempts to apply in order to overthrow the words of the AV1611 as the ‘standard,’ without ever explicitly defining or substantiating them.

And he explains why it is White who engages in the kind of “*circular reasoning,*” of which he repeatedly accuses bible believers. See remarks under **Introduction**.

The ‘circle’ operates like this. The Christian must test all of his beliefs by “*the Scriptures.*” But the only “*scriptures*” are the non-existent “*original autographs*” and therefore no ‘bible,’ certainly not the AV1611, is actually “*the scriptures.*” These can only be reconstructed by comparison of the variants in the manuscripts by enlightened individuals like James White, who will always unerringly choose the variant that best reveals “*the original intent of the author.*” These selected variants will then make up the texts of the MEVs, more ‘enlightened’ versions, whether in Greek or English, that should then be used to overthrow the AV1611 by means of “*the Scriptures*” that the ordinary believer does not have but which James White and co. will happily concoct for the purpose of enabling the Christian to test his beliefs by “*the Scriptures.*”

Thus completing the circle. In other words, ‘the KJV has errors in it, because the critics say so and the critics are always right in this respect – because the KJV has errors in it.’

As Job said<sup>1 p 23</sup>, “**No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you**” Job 12:2.

*“For those who come to this discussion with deep and long-standing commitments to the Authorized Version...please consider well the necessity of examining your beliefs, no matter how cherished they may be, on the basis of God’s truth... We all must constantly test our faith by Scripture, and we must pray for a willingness to abandon those beliefs that are found to be contrary to God’s revealed truth”<sup>3 p vii-viii</sup>.*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 311-12</sup> rightly observes of this statement, that according to his “*deepest Christian conviction,*” White has no “*scripture*” because he has no “*verbally inspired, original autographs.*” He failed to define either “*God’s truth*” or “*God’s revealed truth*” and was unable to specify any portion of “*Scripture*”. He only ever referred to ‘translations’ “*of the [unspecified] Bible.*” Dr Ruckman is quite right in condemning White’s book as “*271 pages of revived “Hortism”...presented as “God’s truth” in order to justify sin.*”

The verse comparisons listed in the **Appendix** have partly refuted White’s two other main postulates, namely that the modern versions often give superior readings to the AV1611 and do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Further refutation will follow as the successive chapters in White’s book are reviewed.

## Chapter 1 – “King James Only”

White’s aim in this chapter is to categorise the ‘KJV-Only’ adherents into five groups, of which “*the most radical*” come under the heading of “*The KJV as New Revelation*,”

White<sup>3 p 4</sup> states that bible believers in this group believe that “*the Greek and Hebrew texts should be changed to fit the readings found in the KJV!*”

He gives no further elaboration and overlooks the fact that some manuscripts *do* exhibit evidence of changes. See comments under ***Rome Rejoices at Revision***, from Dr Scrivener, who noted as many as ten different scribes inserting changes into Sinaiticus. Wilkinson noted how many early corrupters of Greek manuscripts claimed to be “*correcting them.*”

In this respect, David Cloud<sup>6 Part 1</sup> states, “*In the first century, even as the New Testament Scripture was being given, the Apostles were already hounded by false teachers who were corrupting the Word of God (2 Cor. 2:17). This attack increased tremendously during the next two centuries. The Lord Jesus and the Apostles warned repeatedly that false teachers would attempt to corrupt the truth (i.e., Matt. 7:15; 24:3-5,11,24; 2 Cor. 11:1-15; Gal. 1:6-9; Col. 2:8; 1 Tim. 4:1-4; 2 Tim. 3:13; 2 Pet. 2:1-22; 1 John 2:18-26; 4:1; Jude 4). Church history bears out these warnings.*”

See also comments under ***Early Conspirators and Corrupters***. Since Wilkinson has demonstrated that the AV1611 Text has been the true standard of scripture for many centuries, it would not be unreasonable for the texts of corrupted manuscripts to be altered so that they *did* match the AV1611.

Dr Thomas Holland<sup>4</sup> has this comment.

*“This is another example of Mr. White not doing his homework. It is common to refer to the Greek texts of modern versions as “the original.” Since Dr. Ruckman sees these texts as corrupt, he often makes light of them by stating the KJV should be used to correct them. He is not claiming the KJV should be used to correct the authors of the Old and New Testaments, but that the KJV should be used to correct the writings of modern textual critics. As to the superiority of the KJV to the true originals, Ruckman only points out that the originals would serve little purpose to the common English reader since he could not read them but could read his English KJV. Even modern scholars recognize this. Luther A. Weigle quotes Sir Frederic Kenyon, who stated in 1936, “It is the simple truth that, as literature, the English Authorized Version is superior to the original Greek.” [“The New Oxford Annotated Bible With the Apocrypha (Revised Standard Version),” Oxford University Press 1977, p. 1553]. Neither Kenyon, Weigle, nor the committee for the Oxford study Bible could be called followers of Dr. Ruckman or part of the KJV only group, although they did recognize how the KJV was superior to the original Greek. Perhaps White will target these men in his next book on the subject.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 289-92</sup> comments that not only is White’s statement – and his similar remarks in his notes<sup>3 p 6</sup> on the chapter – bereft of examples, but it is also the way that Roman Catholic historians write, i.e. a statement is made to shock the reader into acceptance of the statement without any proof.

He then lists over forty passages to illustrate how the AV1611 readings and their underlying Greek texts are superior to the Westcott-Hort text. They include many that are cited in the **Appendix**; Matthew 1:25, 6:13, 8:29, 16:20, 19:17, 25:13, Mark 1:2, 6:11, 10:21, 24, Luke 2:14, 9:35, 11:2, 4, John 1:18, 3:13, 6:47, 9:5, 6, 35, 22:16, Acts 16:7, Romans 1:16, 13:9, 14:6, 15:29, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 9:1, 10:28, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 11:31, Colos-



sians 1:14, 2:18, 1 Thessalonians 3:11, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 12, 1 Timothy 1:17, 3:16, 2 Timothy 2:15, Hebrews 3:1, James 5:16, 1 Peter 3:14, 2 John 3, Jude 4.

White attempts to justify the modern renderings of the above passages where they depart from the AV1611 and their attendant Greek later in his book and these attempts will be discussed. However, the agreement of many of the modern renderings as found in the NIV, NRSV with Catholic texts, JR, DR, JB and with Watchtower's NWT, shows that they are the kind of Romish corruptions, in both Greek and English, about which Wilkinson warned repeatedly and which the Reformers and King James translators rightly rejected.

These corruptions *should* be changed back to conform to the AV1611.

In 1979, nearly 500 of them *were*, in Nestle's 26<sup>th</sup> edition<sup>8 p 36-8</sup>.

White is either ignorant of the facts, or deliberately trying to obfuscate.

Under the heading of *The Role of Christian Freedom*, White<sup>3 p 5</sup> says, "*The use of a particular English translation of the Bible is surely a personal choice.*"

Again, he makes no mention of what the 'Bible' is, or of bible-belief, only "use" and fails to substantiate the statement with any scripture or qualify it as a matter for prayer.

The Holy Bible's comment is apposite.

***"The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts"*** Psalm 10:4.

Clearly not where White's selection of scripture is concerned<sup>1 p 443</sup>.

White also states on this page, "*If people wish to use the KJV, they should feel free to do so...[but] it cannot be expected that this freedom would be given by those who have joined the KJV Only movement.*"

Dr Holland<sup>4</sup> comments as follows.

*"Here, White has confused conviction for the Authorized Version with confinement to the Authorized Version. Of course the KJV advocate will sound more dogmatic. He is speaking from the conviction that he has a perfect Bible. However, this conviction does not confine others and people are free to use whatever translation they wish to use. The translators of the NIV wrote in the preface, "Like all translations of the Bible, made as they are by imperfect man, this one undoubtedly falls short of its goals." The KJV advocate agrees that the NIV and all other modern versions are imperfect and fall short. Still, anyone is free to read and believe them."*

White concludes this chapter with the statement, "*[KJV Onlyists] very often make my use of anything but the KJV an impediment to our relationship. That sharing in the gospel of Christ can be disrupted by such an issue should cause anyone a moment's reflection, and more than passing concern.*"

"*Sharing in the gospel of Christ*" is not the issue. The issue is what constitutes "***the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever***" 1 Peter 1:23 and where it may be readily accessed between two covers. Dr Wilkinson's treatise – see earlier – has resolved that issue satisfactorily for any honest individual. When any individual such as James White then decides that he is at liberty to alter that word<sup>3 p 5, 26</sup> according to "*personal choice*" and "*my tastes*," he ought not to be surprised to encounter with bible believers "*an impediment to our relationship*" – however the latter term is defined.

Nor should he be surprised to encounter from bible believers the same rebuke that Jeremiah issued to the bible-rejecters of his day.

***“For ye have perverted the words of the living God, of the LORD of hosts our God”***  
Jeremiah 23:36b.

In his concluding note for this chapter, White states, *“We strongly encourage Christians to purchase and use multiple translations of the Bible [unspecified]... Cross-reference between such fine translations as the New King James Version, the New American Standard Bible, and the New International Version will allow the student of the Bible [unspecified] to get a firm grasp upon the meaning of any particular passage.”*

So is the New American Standard Bible the ‘Bible,’ or merely a translation of the ‘Bible’? White does not say. Although he professes that his book *“is not against the King James Version,”* he does not recommend it as a *“translation”* for Christians *“to purchase and use.”* Why not?

Moreover, how could anyone get *“a firm grasp”* on *“any particular passage”* when:

- It may be found in the text of one of the three versions that White recommends, the NKJV
- But denied in the footnotes of that same version
- And omitted from the texts of the other two versions, NIV, NASV, though possibly suggested in the footnotes of these.

The result is unbiblical confusion, ***“For God is not the author of confusion”*** 1 Corinthians 14:33.

Cloud has this observation<sup>6 Part 3</sup>. His remarks also apply to the NASV but as indicated, both versions differ from the text of the NKJV. White fails to resolve the confusion and neither does he address the corruptions that Wilkinson and others identified that in turn have resulted in the departures from ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21, the AV1611, as found in all three of White’s recommended versions.

See also the ***Appendix, Tables A1, A5.***

*“There are 17 verses omitted outright in the New International Version - Mt. 17:21; 18:11; 23:14; Mk. 7:16; 9:44; 9:46; 11:26; 15:28; Lk. 17:36; 23:17; Jn. 5:4; Ac. 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Ro. 16:24; and 1 Jn. 5:7. Further, the NIV separates Mk. 16:9-20 from the rest of the chapter with a note that says, “The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mk. 16:9-20,” thus destroying the authority of this vital passage in the minds of the readers and effectively removing another 12 verses. Jn. 7:53--8:11 is also separated from the rest of the text with this footnote: “The earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have Jn. 7:53--8:11.” Hence another 12 verses are effectively removed from the Bible. The NIV questions four other verses with footnotes - Mt. 12:47; 21:44; Lk. 22:43; 22:44. This makes a total of 45 entire verses which are removed entirely or seriously questioned. In addition there are 147 other verses with significant portions missing. This is a huge portion of Scripture which is affected by textual changes, and yet White claims there is no serious problem. I don’t agree, and I will not be brow beaten into submission by men who seem to be infinitely patient with the corruption of the biblical text. I am not impressed with their broadmindedness in this matter.”*

As the Lord Jesus Christ said, of which White should take careful note.

***“Broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat”***  
Matthew 7:13b.

A further point that White overlooks is that his recommendation “*to purchase and use multiple translations of the Bible*” fails to consider Christians in the developing world, their families and their churches.

How are they supposed to afford “*multiple translations of the Bible*”?

James White fails to address this question.

He is not very missionary minded. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks in point 2 of ***Conclusions from the Study*** in **Author’s Introduction**.

## Chapter 2 – “If It Ain’t Broke...”

White uses this chapter to accuse AV1611 bible believers of being mere ‘traditionalists,’ who have their counterpart in church history amongst individuals who opposed Erasmus “for daring to “change” [Jerome’s Vulgate]” with his Greek New Testament<sup>3 p 15-17</sup>. AV1611 bible believers are therefore “anti-biblical,” according to White, who continues to leave the term ‘bible’ undefined explicitly.

White bases his accusation on the following statement<sup>3 p 10</sup>.

*“KJV Only individuals are not generally interested in church history as a subject.”*

No doubt sensing that this outrageous lie will inevitably attract criticism, White qualifies it by adding, “Surely there are some who take an interest in it, but by and large such people suffer from the same apathy about our Christian heritage as most other Protestants in America.”

Where is the evidence that supporters of modern versions are any different in this respect? White furnishes none. He has a double standard in this respect, a term that he uses repeatedly to denigrate AV1611 bible believers<sup>3 p 107, 162, 170, 173, 232, 236, 244</sup>.

Cloud notes<sup>6 Part 1</sup> with respect to White’s assertion above.

*“This is one of the strangest statements in this strange book. I don’t know what people White has in mind, and I don’t know what part of Mars he has been living on, but many of the King James Bible defenders with whom I fellowship are keenly interested in church history. Many of them, including me, have built extensive libraries in this area of research. I have rare books on the history of the Waldensians, the Baptists, the Roman Catholic Church, etc., which I have obtained at great expense, having paid as much as \$1000 for one set of books and several hundred dollars each for other books and sets. I have diligently searched out volumes on the subject of the text and transmission of the Bible, and on visits to serious theological libraries, including the British Library, I have added to my collection via copies of rare books on microfiche and photocopies of rare books which I have not been able to purchase outright. My personal library on the history of the English Bible and the transmission of the Scripture text is a very serious collection. White might reply, “You are an exception, Brother Cloud,” but in my experience and knowledge of KJV defenders, I can say that he is wrong. I personally know hundreds of King James Bible defenders who love church history and have studied it diligently.”*

In addition to Wilkinson’s extensive research into church history, this writer can confirm that virtually all the authors that White vilifies<sup>3 p v, 18, 56-7</sup> as “King James Only” have written most informative church histories, as they relate to the preservation of the scriptures. White even cites the book *Final Authority* by Dr Bill Grady in his *Introduction* but refuses to acknowledge this detailed work for the wealth of historical information it provides with respect to the scriptures. Likewise, *The History of the New Testament Church*, Volumes 1 and 2, and *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* by Dr Ruckman, *In Awe of Thy Word*, by Dr Mrs Riplinger,\* *Famine in the Land* by Norman Ward, *God Only Wrote One Bible* by Jasper James Ray and *An Understandable History of the Bible*, by Dr Sam Gipp. White mentions the works by Gipp, Ray and Ward but largely ignores their extensive contents. Instead, he attempts to disparage the authors by referencing, without proof, pages within these book where the comments are supposedly not truly historical but “meant to evoke emotional, rather than rational, responses.”

Again, White is lying.

One of his references is that of Ward<sup>35 p 46</sup>, who states, in part, *“In 312 A.D. the Roman emperor Constantine made one of the world’s most questioned conversions to Christianity...Following his conversion, Constantine asked a fellow named Eusebius to make him fifty copies of the Bible. Unfortunately, Eusebius was the wrong man to ask. He was an Arian (one who denies the deity of Christ) and a great admirer of Origen. Consequently, the fifty Bibles he produced for Constantine were based on the corrupt work of Origen.*

*“By the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century, Latin had displaced Greek as the universal language of the Western Empire. The New Testament had been translated into Latin around 150 A.D. This Old Latin translation, however, was a translation based on the Majority tradition and therefore totally unsuitable for use in the paganized Roman church. A new translation based on the Alexandrian tradition was obviously the answer. This translation was made by Jerome and became known as Jerome’s Latin Vulgate.”*

The reader may check White’s other page references for their actual contents. Even if expressed with the vehemence of a genuine believer in *“the scripture of truth,”* Daniel 10:21, they reveal similarly objective historical details, which closely match the entirely *“rational”* treatise of Dr Wilkinson.

Moreover, White<sup>3 p 97ff</sup> later accuses Gail Riplinger of *“out-of-context citations and edited quotations”* in her 700-page work *New Age Versions*, while he himself supplies no citations or quotations at all in this part of his book in his efforts to discredit those authors.

White is again resorting to a double standard and is fully deserving of the rebukes he has received from Dr Ruckman, Dr Mrs Riplinger, Dr Gipp and other bible-believing authors.

\*This 1200-page study appeared 10 years after White published his book but Dr Mrs Riplinger’s *New Age Versions* contains much of the historical material in outline and White has yet even to acknowledge her exhaustive researches on his web site<sup>36</sup>, such is his ongoing and ungodly Calvinistic contempt for this gracious and courageous sister in Christ.

Whitney has this observation of White’s demeanour when dealing with anyone who would question his assertions.

*“I corresponded with Mr. White about his book. I asked him some questions regarding his book and his beliefs that were essentially designed to set him up. When I got to some of the before mentioned points in this article, he cut off communication saying that I was like Dr. Ruckman and wasn’t worth the time. I never called him a name or cut him down. The man, when confronted with evidence that contradicts what he wrote, threw out a flurry of statements like “you can’t trust any quote Dr. Ruckman has in his books,” and then cut me off. The impression I got from him is that he thinks that his position is absolutely correct and any other position is inferior, the same attitude he accuses his opponents of having. He also admitted to me that his Reformed beliefs have influenced his views on the bible. If this is the case, then should we not question his motives?”*

*“Can we trust a Hyper-Calvinist with the Bible issue?”*

*“Mr. White is a hyper-Calvinist. He is a member of a reformed Baptist church. Go to his web site and see (Alpha and Omega Ministries). We need to take this into consideration when reading his book. Since he admitted to me that his beliefs have influenced his views on the bible, we need to take what he writes with caution as we should with any other hyper-Calvinist. I personally believe that he thinks his view of biblical transmission is the predestinated way that God did it and no other way is valid.”*

White’s brusqueness when responding to Tom Whitney is reminiscent of ‘our critic,’ who features in this writer’s book<sup>8 p 97ff</sup>, *“O Biblios.”* He too was a hyper-Calvinist.

Whitney has further comments on White's double standards and his tendency towards dogmatic assertion by which he accuses bible believers of being mere 'traditionalists.'

*"White accuses his opponents of using double standards (107). Does he use double standards in his book? White attacks Erasmus for being a catholic who believed in some heretical catholic doctrine, but then uses Jerome and Augustine as authorities (12, 13). He doesn't tell the reader that Jerome and Augustine were Catholics who believed the same heretical doctrine that Erasmus did. He also doesn't tell the reader that one of the committee members for a United Bible Societies' text\* (a text similar to the Nestle-Aland text) is a catholic (Carlo M. Martini). He implies that we should not trust a catholic scholar (especially Erasmus pp. 84-85), but does not tell the reader that catholic scholars accept Nestle's text (25<sup>th</sup> edition) as the standard for their bibles (Jerusalem and New American) and that the Catholic Church uses translations based on this text. Based on his implication stated above, if the catholic church accepts it, why should we?"*

*"\*The Greek New Testament, Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, Third Edition, United Bible Societies, copyright 1966, 1968, 1975"*

White also repeatedly fails to inform the reader about the agreement between the "fine translations" such as the NIV, NASV that he recommends<sup>3 p 7</sup> and Catholic bibles, such as the JR, DR, JB and Watchtower's NWT. More double standard. Whitney continues.

*"He says that his opponents use tradition (9-10) to support their views, but does not tell the reader that the committee who produced Nestle's 27<sup>th</sup> edition wrote the following, "The criteria used for determining the text are traditionally those of internal and external criticism," (49). Is their tradition superior? What basis (biblical?) do we use to determine if their tradition is better than ours? Since they do not tell the reader what these criteria are, how can we know that they are superior? How can we apply them "with an appropriate sense of balance?" if we don't know what they are, Mr. White?"*

No wonder White cut Whitney off, if he asked questions like these!

White began this chapter<sup>3 p 9</sup> with the statement that "We are not to be so attached to our traditions...that we are unwilling to improve ourselves or our service to Christ. Balance is the key." He concludes the chapter<sup>3 p 17</sup> by saying, "Traditions must be tested, and that includes traditions that touch on the use of particular translations or texts."

To which it may be answered that this work has shown how thoroughly Wilkinson researched "traditions that touch on the use of particular translations or texts."

The results of his research demonstrate that White's allegedly "balanced" attempts to label bible believers as mere 'traditionalists' without historical foundation for their commitment to the AV1611 as the pure word of God "without admixture or error" are as Belshazzar in Daniel 5:27.

***"TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting."***

### Chapter 3 – “Starting at the Beginning”

White uses this chapter to describe methods of translation, manuscript sources, and variations in readings in these sources in order to persuade the reader that God actually preserved His words in the mutilated Alexandrian manuscripts more accurately than in the majority of manuscripts stemming from Antioch of Syria, which in White’s wholly unsubstantiated opinion<sup>3 p 43, 46, 153, 177</sup> suffered from “*expansions of piety*.”

As the reason for including this chapter, White states<sup>3 p 19</sup> “*We cannot avoid dealing with [“manuscripts,” “text-types,” and “textual variants”] if we are going to be thorough in replying to those who present the AV as the only true English translation of the [unspecified] Bible.*” He makes reference in this context to “*any Christian who can read and understand the Bible*” but once again, fails to state where “*the Bible*” can be obtained between two covers.

It should be remembered that.

- The scriptures draw a distinct difference<sup>8 p 10ff</sup> between Antioch, where “*the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch*” Acts 11:26 and which had the first bible teachers, Acts 13:1, and Alexandria, in Egypt, “*the iron furnace*” Deuteronomy 4:20, whose greatest bible teacher, Apollos, did not have a complete bible for those times and whose bible ‘version’ had to be corrected by Christians of Antioch, via Ephesus, Acts 18:19, 22, 24-26.
- 95-99% of the manuscript evidence favours the readings of the AV1611 against the modern versions that White favours. See remarks by Burgon, in the comments on *White’s Introduction*, by Wilkinson in the comments under *Early Conspirators and Corrupters* and by Waite, under *The Revision Conspiracy*.
- The manuscripts of Antioch enjoyed a much greater circulation than those of Alexandria, which the Lord ignored. See *Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare*.
- That the mutilated Alexandrian manuscripts found their way to Rome, to become the basis for Jerome’s corrupt Vulgate, is explained by Acts 27:6, 28:11, with reference to “*a ship of Alexandria,*” which conveyed Paul to Rome as a prisoner.

See also this author’s summary<sup>8 p 105ff</sup> of “*manuscripts,*” “*text-types,*” and “*textual variants*” for a further discussion of Antiochan versus Alexandrian manuscript sources.

White counts himself<sup>3 p 20</sup> as among “*those of us who know [Greek and Hebrew].*” Clearly he intends that the reader should trust his scholarship with respect to these languages. But how ‘scholarly’ is James White?

Cloud<sup>6 Part 1</sup> writes “*Many friends have asked me to review the popular book *The King James Only Controversy: Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* by James White (1963- ) (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1995, 286 p.). White was educated at Southern Baptist Grand Canyon University and at Fuller Theological Seminary, both hotbeds of New Evangelical (and worse) compromise. It does not surprise me to see him parroting the tired theories of the undependable textual critics. What does surprise me is how widely White’s book has been accepted in Fundamental Baptist circles.*”

Some years ago, Texe Marrs, *Power of Prophecy*, [www.texemarrs.com](http://www.texemarrs.com), noted that<sup>37</sup> “*White’s book has...met with indifference since its release and has flopped in the Christian marketplace. Notable, the book was published by Bethany House, a press that, until the advent of Mr White’s ‘scholarly’ tome, had mostly gained a measure of fame for pub-*

lishing a series of romance-type, feminine, western novelettes...Interestingly, Mr White's book attacking the King James Bible is endorsed by a Mr Norm Geisler – his name is right on the cover. Now, Geisler also just happens to be a strong promoter of the ungodly Catholics and Evangelicals together, the unity document put together by Chuck Colson and apostate Catholic priest Richard Neuhaus. That's the papal-approved treatise which warns Protestants not to evangelise Catholics, among other atrocities. It is telling that White uses the pro-Catholic, ecumenical Norman Geisler to publicly endorse his book."

Also telling that many of the RV, NIV, NRSV departures from the AV1611 that White supports also match the Catholic JR, DR, JB and Catholic-based NWT with respect to these departures. See **Appendix**.

This site<sup>38</sup> has further comment on White's 'scholarship.'

*"It seems that right after her book came out, Riplinger successfully addressed the issue of the KJV- only Controversy with James White through her website and the radio interviews she had.*

*"White responded: He went back and did some re-editing of his book for future editions, [Did you catch that point: He Re-Edited his own book !!!! and then put out a revised edition, which then gave the impression that Gail had misquoted him. Compare 1) what Riplinger wrote with 2) the FIRST Edition of the KJV-Only Controversy by James White]*

*"but this re-edited version did not respond to Gail's points. What continues to disturb us is that Even If only 50% of what Gail said\* – was in fact, accurate, this would still be (and is) a major indication of a major problem with those Modern Versions."*

\*The site's owners regard Gail Riplinger's work as 100% correct. They explain that they are using a hypothetical 'worst case scenario.' The site continues.

*"No one seems to have noticed that James White is a consultant to the NASB revision, and therefore has a financial relationship with the Lockman Foundation. Some evangelicals were sucked into doing a revision...in the 1940s and 1950s that became the NASB, and ever since they made that decision (which was one to fundamentally support the Westcott/Hort text), this put them at odds with the historic manuscripts of the Bible. D. A. Carson pleaded for "realism" in one of his books (he seems to like the Nestle-Aland text very much), but no one noticed that he is a translator for the New Living Translation.*

*"Did anyone really think that either D. A. Carson or James White would contradict Modern Versions that they played a part in translating ?"*

A good question. No wonder White's book is so anti-conspiracy – see remarks under **White's Introduction**. He seems to be part of one himself, to exalt the NASV and its close companion the NIV *against* the God-honoured AV1611, as part of the on-going warfare that Wilkinson described. White's motives for so doing can only be guessed at but it is probably a lucrative project.

As the Apostle Paul observed **"For the love of money is the root of all evil"** 1 Timothy 6:10.

White then repeats<sup>3 p 21</sup> the familiar refrain, beloved of bible-critics, *"Greek...far exceeds English in its ability to convey intricate meanings and delicate turns of thought."*

So why didn't God preserve it as a contemporary language? Why is New Testament Greek a dead language<sup>8 p 101</sup> today? Again, if White was not so contemptuous of Gail



Riplinger, he could learn much from her researches about the power of the biblical English of the AV1611.

For example, she<sup>39 p 440ff</sup> states that “*There are at least 7 reasons why we must preserve the church’s treasure, the King James Bible, with its endings on verbs, like ‘lovest’ and cometh’...*”

1. *The endings reveal the underlying Greek and Hebrew verb tenses, making reading comprehension easier.*
2. *The endings make vital theological distinctions.* (She illustrates with the wording of Matthew 23:37 and Luke 13:34, where the *st* AV1611 word endings for “**kill-est**” and “**stonest**” indicate that the Lord is rebuking the scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem, not the city itself, otherwise He would have used the *th* third person singular endings for “*killeth*” and “*stoneth*.” Compare Ezra 4:19, “**the city of old time HATH made insurrection.**” The NKJV and NASV are doctrinally in error in these passages because they use “*kills*” and “*stones*” for the modern third person singular, erroneously with reference to the city. (The NIV happens to get the readings correct, using the expression “*you who kill...and stone*” but fails to indicate that the “*you*” is an insert in Matthew 23:37, which is therefore italicised in the AV1611 and inserts “*you*” after “*Jerusalem*” in Luke 13:34 without informing the reader that this is therefore a paraphrase and thus inferior to the AV1611 renderings.)
3. *The endings help both young and old learn to read and comprehend the Bible.*
4. *Children prefer the sound pattern these endings create, linguists have discovered.*
5. *The endings contribute to cognitive function (thinking and understanding); they contribute to the “separate from sinners” element of the Holy Bible’s vocabulary.*
6. *The endings contribute to the rhythmic “comfort” of the scriptures (Romans 15:4). The alternative sound, zzzzzzzzzzzzz, is not conducive to the “comfort of the scriptures” (lovezzz, comezzz). Unnecessarily, new version readers (and no-Bible readers) pop pills like prozzzzzac.* (White<sup>3 p iv</sup> accuses bible believers of distracting pastors and elders via KJV-Onlyism from “*time that should be spent in ministry to families, the sick, the hurting.*” So why has he overlooked something so basic as the built-in comfort ministry of the AV1611 word endings – in addition to supporting bibles such as the NIV, NASV, NRSV that omit the phrase “**to heal the brokenhearted**” in Luke 4:18, along with the JB, NWT<sup>8 p 69?</sup> White<sup>3 p 97-8</sup> evens refers to the incident in which Gail Riplinger<sup>14 p 453-4</sup> first realised this omission, when she was endeavouring to comfort a distraught young female undergraduate *but White omits this part of the incident and in turn fails to mention that the phrase is found in ALL Greek manuscripts EXCEPT Aleph and B.* He is more than ‘inconsistent’ – which charge he repeatedly levels at bible believers, see remarks under **White’s Introduction** – he is a lying hypocrite.)
7. *Missionaries need these endings to bridge the language gap between English and many of the world’s languages which have these same endings.”*

Mrs Riplinger follows up the above points with detailed documented evidence. In addition to her concern for comforting “**the brokenhearted,**” which far outstrips White’s, to judge by his book, she demonstrates a heartfelt preoccupation with children’s understanding of the scriptures and with the challenges that missionaries face. White’s book fails to address either of these concerns to any appreciable extent.

White<sup>3 p 23-25</sup> then tries to justify the NIV's paraphrased rendering of Luke 9:44, asserting that the AV1611 reading "***Let these sayings sink down into your ears***" is inferior because "*we do not speak this way any longer.*"

White's limited research compared to Gail Riplinger's – see above – explains his lack of understanding in this respect. Dr Thomas Holland<sup>4</sup> puts matters in proper perspective, outlining the danger of paraphrasing or "*thought-for-thought translation*" as found in the NIV.

He states "*White insists that modern versions are better because they are more understandable. To illustrate he uses two foreign phrases, in reality idioms, to make his case (p. 23). 'The French have a saying that goes, 'J'ai le cafard.'*" The literal translation would be, "I have a cockroach," but the understood meaning is, "I am depressed," or "I have the blues." He also uses the example of the German phrase "Morgenstund' hat Gold im Mund'," which means, "Morning hours have gold in the mouth," or to fit our English expression, "The early bird catches the worm." These examples allegedly show why dynamic equivalent translations such as the NIV are "better" than a literal translation such as the KJV. The scriptural reference he gives comes from Luke 9:44 which reads, "Let these sayings sink down into your ears" (KJV), as opposed to "Listen carefully to what I am about to tell you" (NIV).

"The dynamic equivalent translation discards the doctrine of the preservation of God's words and promotes thought-for-thought translation instead. One could argue the accuracy of such a translation and the fear of whose thoughts are being related in the process. The point is two fold. One, there are few idiomatic expressions in scripture to justify the use of thought translations. Two, the very example White uses proves the point. For the English reader, is the phrase, "Let these sayings sink down into your ears" as difficult to comprehend as the connotation of the French idiom, "I have the cockroach"? Surely, White could have provided us with a better example."

In his note on this discussion, White<sup>3 p 49</sup> naturally insists that the NASV's use of "words" in the passage is superior to the AV1611 reading "***sayings.***" The underlying Greek term is the familiar word *logos*. Where it appears in the plural, e.g. Matthew 7:24, 26, 28, 19:1, 26:1, Luke 1:65, 2:51, 6:47, 7:1, 9:44, John 10:19, 14:24, Acts 14:18, 19:28 (in Italics), Romans 3:4, Revelation 19:9, 22:6, 7, 9, 10, the AV1611 has "***sayings***" denoting an arrangement of words.

The NASV has "words," Matthew 7:24, 26, 28, 19:1, 26:1, Luke 6:47, 9:44, John 10:19, 14:24, Romans 3:4, Revelation 19:9, 22:6, 7, 9, 10, "matters," Luke 1:65, "things," Luke 2:51 – detracting from what the Lord had said, Luke 2:47-50, "discourse," Luke 7:1, "sayings" (!), Luke 9:28, John 10:19, 14:24, "saying these things," Acts 14:18, "*this*" (Italics) Acts 19:28. though the AV1611's plural "***sayings***" is superior because Demetrius makes five major points in the speech to his fellow craftsmen, Acts 19:25-27.

The NASV is clearly not as "*perfectly formal*" as White would have his readers believe. He is lying again.

Where *logos* is in the singular form, the AV1611 has "***saying***" in Matthew 15:12, 19:11, 22, Mark 7:29, 8:32, 9:10, 10:22, Luke 1:29, John 4:37, 39, 6:60, 7:36, 40, 8:51, 52, 55, 12:38, 15:20, 18:9, 32, 19:8, 13, 21:23, Acts 6:5, 7:29, 16:36, Romans 13:9, 1 Corinthians 15:54, 1 Timothy 1:15, 3:1, 4:9, 2 Timothy 2:11, Titus 3:8.

The NASV has "*statement,*" Matthew 15:12, 19:11, 22, Mark 9:10, Luke 1:29, John 6:60, 7:36, 19:8, Acts 6:5, 1 Timothy 1:15, 3:1, 4:9, 2 Timothy 2:11, Titus 3:8, "*answer,*" Mark 7:29, "*matter,*" Mark 8:32, "*words,*" Mark 10:22, John 7:40, 19:13, Acts 16:36,

“saying,” John 4:37, 21:23, Romans 13:9, 1 Corinthians 15:54, “word,” John 4:39, John 8:51, 52, 55, 12:38, 15:20, 18:9, 32, “remark,” Acts 7:29.

Again, the NASV is clearly not as “*perfectly formal*” as White would have his readers believe and again, he is lying.

White then attempts to prove that the AV1611 reading in Amos 4:4, “*your tithes after three years*” is inferior to the NASV, NKJV reading “*your tithes every three days*” because the NKJV reading is “*the literal rendering of the Hebrew text.*”

However, as Dr Ruckman points out<sup>40 p 265</sup>, The Av1611 is correct because the verse refers to the Jew keeping the letter of the law:

**“At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates:”** Deuteronomy 14:28.

**“When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing,”** Deuteronomy 26:12a.

Dr Ruckman also indicates that the reading “*your tithes every third day,*” which the NASV, NKJV effectively copy, is from the Septuagint, as indeed it is<sup>41</sup>. However, the literal translation is incorrect because it conflicts with the procedure for tithing found in Deuteronomy.

White then makes the extraordinary statement<sup>3 p 26</sup>, “*the NIV provides numerous examples of dynamic translations for which it has been severely criticized... “flesh” in Paul’s epistles as “sinful nature” [is] a bit too interpretive for my tastes.*”

See remarks under **Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath** and the comments on White’s first chapter. White’s<sup>3 p vii</sup> “*highest standard of truth*” is his own opinion, as Dr Ruckman emphasises<sup>1 p 24-27</sup>.

Returning to the subject of Bible history, White states with respect to a widespread lack of knowledge on the history of bible transmission, “*This lack of study not only provides the breeding ground of the KJV Only controversy, but it is an “opening” through which cultic groups often enter into the thinking of the unsuspecting believer.*”

See remarks earlier on bible transmission under **White’s Introduction, White’s Main Postulates Refuted** and on White’s Chapter 2. Dr Ruckman observed<sup>1 p 193-4</sup> White’s “*inconsistency*” in that he condoned removal of the word “**study**” from 2 Timothy 2:15<sup>3 p 140</sup> but now expects his readers to engage in bible “*study.*” Dr Ruckman adds that White does not identify any “*cultic groups*” nor does he specify what “*the unsuspecting believer*” is supposed to believe in.

One wonders how White will answer the following question at the Judgement Seat of Christ, Romans 14:10.

**“How hast thou plentifully declared the thing as it is?”** Job 26:3b.

His failure to do so reinforces the comment above that White has no ‘final authority’ in matters of faith and practice other than his own opinion. See also remarks under **White’s Main Postulates Refuted.**

White would do well to reflect on the wisdom of Solomon.

**“He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool: but whoso walketh wisely, he shall be delivered”** Proverbs 28:26.

White<sup>3 p 33ff</sup> then describes Codex Sinaiticus or Aleph as “vilified more than any other manuscript by the KJV Only advocates” because “at best unbalanced” claims are made for Aleph and Vaticanus B but “this is hardly a reasonable charge” to “accuse modern textual critics of “worshipping” Aleph and B.”

The charge is entirely reasonable. See Burgon’s remarks on Aleph and B in *Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness* and Wilkinson’s in *The Revision Conspiracy*.

“Hort’s partiality for the Vatican Manuscript was practically absolute.

“We can almost hear him say, *The Vaticanus have I loved, but the Textus Receptus have I hated.*”

Burgon said further<sup>13 p 350</sup> about Westcott and Hort’s fixation with Vaticanus.

“*The Nemesis of Superstition and Idolatry is ever the same. Phantoms of the imagination henceforth usurp the place of substantial forms. Interminable doubt, [James White<sup>3 p 95</sup>: “Those who offer absolute certainty do so at a cost: individual responsibility”] - wretched misbelief, childish credulity, - judicial blindness, - are the inevitable sequel and penalty. The mind that has long allowed itself in a systematic trifling with Evidence, is observed to fall the easiest prey to Imposture. It has doubted what is demonstrably true: has rejected what is indubitably Divine. Henceforth, it is observed to mistake its own fantastic creations for historical facts: [White’s<sup>3 p 38, 43, 46, 156, 177</sup> “expansions of piety” and “harmonisation”] to believe things which rest on insufficient evidence, or on no evidence at all [White<sup>3 p 33</sup> terms Vaticanus B “another great Codex.” See remarks under *Early Conspirators and Corrupters*].”*

Westcott and Hort *did* idolise, or worship, Aleph and B. Later modern version editors are not greatly different. Note again that the NIV translators refer to Aleph and B as “*The most reliable early manuscripts*” with respect to the allegedly disputed passages, Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11<sup>8 p 66, 74</sup>.

Where the modern editors wish to alter the AV1611 Text, they repeatedly follow Aleph and B – although they will use another source if Aleph and B *agree* with the AV1611, e.g. Luke 24:12, where D is used to overthrow the AV1611<sup>8 p 291ff</sup>. See also Moorman’s extensive documentation<sup>9, 11</sup>.

White then adds, “*Codex Sinaiticus is not nearly as bad as its enemies would say...It is not infallible, nor is it demonic. It is instead a great treasure...for all time a tremendously valuable asset to our knowledge of the New Testament text. Those who say it is “corrupt” normally mean it is different in places than the traditional text that underlies the KJV. Others accuse it of being so full of errors as to be almost useless. There are indeed many corrections in the text of Aleph, but...A handwritten text that is used for 1,500 years is going to collect a few corrections along the way!*”

White gives no standard of infallibility, other than his unspecified “*highest standard of truth.*” See **Introduction**. A few months before his death<sup>42</sup>, Charles Haddon Spurgeon said this.

“*If this Book be not infallible, where shall we find infallibility? We have given up the Pope, for he has blundered often and terrible, but we shall set up instead of him a horde of little popelings, fresh from college.*

“*Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Is it certain that our Bibles are not right, but that the critics must be so? But where shall infallibility be found? The depth saith, ‘It*

*is not in me' yet those who have no depth at all would have us imagine that it is in them; or else by perpetual change they hope to hit upon it!"*

Enter James White – and the NIV translators, whose work “*is never wholly finished.*” See Preface to the NIV and remarks under ***Early Conspirators and Corrupters.***

White also gives no indication of how Sinaiticus was “*used*” such that it required so many corrections. Moreover, he cannot provide any equivalent example from the manuscripts underlying the Received Text and fails to appreciate that even Dr Hort remarked on the near-identical nature of the majority of cursive manuscripts. See remarks under ***Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness.*** See also Wilkinson’s comments on the two streams of bibles, under ***White’s Introduction.***

White naturally tries to explain away this uniformity by means of sheer speculation<sup>3 p 38</sup> on alleged “*harmonisation*” of these manuscripts – in spite of their wide-ranging and geographically independent locations, see remarks under ***God’s Book – the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible*** – but fails to explain why scribes of the cursives or Traditional Text manuscripts were ‘harmonisers’ while those associated with Sinaiticus were ‘correctors.’ Why wouldn’t both groups manifest the same scribal tendencies, if, as even White acknowledges, the AV1611, deriving from the majority of near-identical cursives is<sup>3 p vii</sup> “*a great, yet imperfect translation of the [unspecified] Bible*” and Sinaiticus is “*a great treasure.*”

Yet again, therefore, White is being inconsistent, especially insofar as he fails to discuss the contents of Aleph and B<sup>8 p 13-14</sup>. See remarks under ***Early Conspirators and Corrupters.*** He also fails to address Burgon’s objections to Aleph and B, noted earlier and those of Dr Scrivener. See remarks under ***The Revision Conspiracy, Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath*** and ***God’s Book – the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.***

(In his notes on this chapter, White<sup>3 p 49</sup> makes the strange statement that “*the vast majority of “Byzantine” manuscripts were copied by Roman Catholic monks in the centuries prior to the Reformation*” and accuses bible believers of overlooking this apparent ‘fact.’ White’s assertion is patently false. See Wilkinson’s remarks under ***White’s Introduction.*** “*“Epiphanius, in his polemic treatise the ‘Panarion,’ describes not less than eighty heretical parties.” The Roman Catholics won. The true church fled into the wilderness, taking pure manuscripts with her... “The first stream [of bibles] which carried the Received Text in Hebrew and Greek, began with the apostolic churches. [It] was protected...by the Syrian Church of Antioch which produced eminent scholarship; by the Italic Church in Northern Italy...the Gallic Church in southern France and by the Celtic Church in Great Britain; by the pre-Waldensian, the Waldensian and the churches of the Reformation.”* These churches were not Catholic Churches and the copyists were not Catholic monks. Recall that Wilkinson describes in detail how Rome sought to overthrow the Received Text derived from the Byzantine manuscripts with her corrupted manuscripts of Alexandria. See his remarks under ***Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare.*** “*The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know. The type of Bible selected by Constantine has held the dominating influence at all times in the history of the Catholic Church. This Bible was different from the Bible of the Waldenses, and, a result of this difference, the Waldenses were the object of hatred and cruel persecution.*”

Note also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s observation<sup>39 p 967-8</sup>. “*We are sometimes given the false impression that during the Middle Ages, the only Bibles were those produced by a few*

monks... On the contrary, F. Somer Merryweather asserts that “secular copyists... were an important class during the Middle Ages” and “ancient manuscripts were by no means so very scarce...” “The price for copying a Bible was only “eighty Bolognese liveres...” Those seeking their skills “were particularly numerous in the tenth century...””

The conclusions of genuine scholars such as Burgon, who actually studied the old codices are as follows<sup>13. p 11, 16, 314-317, 319-320, 325, 337, 343, 344, 376, 397</sup>

*“B, Aleph, C, D, but especially B and Aleph, have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the Critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition. It matters nothing that all four are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only from ninety-nine out of a hundred of the whole body of extant MSS. Besides, but even from one another. This last circumstance, obviously fatal to their corporate pretensions, is unaccountably overlooked. And yet it admits of only one satisfactory explanation: viz. that in different degrees they all five [including A] exhibit a fabricated text. Between [B and Aleph] there subsists an amount of sinister resemblance, which proves they must have been derived at no very remote period from the same corrupt original [Yet]...It is in fact easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two MSS. Differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree...”*

*“We venture to assure [the reader], without a particle of hesitation, that Aleph B D are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant: - exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with...the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of the Truth, - which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God.*

*“The impurity of the Texts exhibited by Codices B and Aleph is not a matter of opinion but a matter of fact. These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence. So far from allowing Dr. Hort’s position that ‘A Text formed by taking Codex B as the sole authority would be incomparably nearer the truth than a Text similarly taken from any other Greek or single document’ we venture to assert that it would be on the contrary, by far the foulest Text that had ever seen the light: worse, that is to say, even than the Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort. And that is saying a great deal. In the brave and faithful words of Prebendary Scrivener, - words which deserve to become famous, - [which is why they are repeated here – see **White’s Introduction**]*

*““It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Irenaeus (AD 150) and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stucia, or Erasmus, or Stephen thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus.”*

*“Codices B and Aleph are, demonstrably, nothing else but specimens of the depraved class thus characterized.”*

*“We suspect that these two mss. are indebted for their preservation; solely to their ascertained evil character; which has occasioned that one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican library: while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in AD 1844) got deposited in the waste-paper basket of the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai.”*

White<sup>3 p 33, 50</sup> tries to insist that Sinaiticus is “a great treasure” because a monk presented Tischendorf with it “wrapped in a red cloth [but] the Monk had no idea of the treasure he held in his hands.” “Hardly the way one treats trash,” White adds.

Daniels<sup>43 p 151ff</sup> comments on White’s speculations above as follows.

*“Tischendorf does not say that the codex Sinaiticus was in the trash/kindling bin. But John Burgon does. And he was THERE: He actually saw the manuscripts and pored over them (both the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus)...The most likely scenario is that Burgon was right: The Sinaiticus was originally in the piles of paper to be burned. But just like my children, who only want one of their toys when “someone else” wants it, so the monks at St. Catherine’s (or at least the steward) thought twice afterward about whether they would burn the ancient codex or keep it, much less ever give it away. So the huge codex was rescued, now realising its value, and kept...in a private place, wrapping it in a red cloth so set it apart from the kindling.”*

Burgon continues.

*“Had B and Aleph been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight. But in the meantime, behold, their very Antiquity has come to be reckoned to their advantage; and (strange to relate) is even considered to constitute a sufficient reason why they should enjoy not merely extraordinary consideration, but the actual surrender of the critical judgement. Since 1831\*, Editors have vied with one another in the fulsomeness of the homage they have paid to these ‘two false witnesses,’ – for such B and Aleph are, as the concurrent testimony of Copies, Fathers and Versions abundantly proves. Even superstitious reverence has been claimed for these two codices: and Drs. Westcott and Hort are so far in advance of their predecessors in the servility of their blind adulation, that they must be allowed to have easily won the race.”*

\*See Mauro’s description of nineteenth century Greek New Testament editors who preceded Westcott and Hort<sup>8 p 149ff</sup>.

*“The craven homage which [B] habitually receives at the hands of Drs. Westcott and Hort, I can only describe as a weak superstition. It is something more than unreasonable. It becomes even ridiculous.”*

But according to White<sup>3 p 33ff</sup>, “this is hardly a reasonable charge” to “accuse modern textual critics of “worshiping” Aleph and B.” Again, he is being inconsistent and incorrect. Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 100, 122</sup> cites modern author Jay Green as follows, emphases are Dr Ruckman’s.

*““In 1989 it should be noted that Burgon’s remarks are still valid for the New Translations, the UBS [United Bible Societies] Greek text, and the Nestle Greek text are still based mainly on the Westcott and Hort Greek text, and since they also hew closely to the mistaken adherence of those corrupt manuscripts, Aleph and B, the NEB, NASV, NIV, and other modern translations based on those Greek texts also err grievously, misleading the unlearned and unsuspecting public.”*

*““Tischendorf worshipped Aleph to the point of ABSURDITY...and Westcott and Hort had the same unreasonable WORSHIP of Codex B.””*

Burgon continues.

*“Turn which way we would, we were encountered by the same confident terminology: - ‘the best documents,’ - ‘primary manuscripts,’ - ‘first-rate authorities,’ - primitive evidence,’ - ‘ancient readings,’ - and so forth: and we found that thereby cod. A or B, - co. C or D - were invariably and exclusively meant. It was not until we had laboriously collated these documents (including Aleph) for ourselves, that we became aware of their true character. Long before coming to the end of our task (and it occupied us, of and on, for eight years) we had become convinced that the supposed ‘best documents’ and ‘first rate authorities’ are in reality among the worst...[and] that the deference generally claimed for B. Aleph C, D is nothing else but a weak superstition and a vulgar error.”*

The above is a scholarly evaluation of White’s assertion<sup>3 p 33</sup> that Codex Aleph is “a great treasure...for all time a tremendously valuable asset to our knowledge of the New Testament text” and Codex B “another great Codex.”

Burgon states further, making a salient point that White signally overlooked.

*“Dr. Hort contends that [the Truth of Scripture] more than half lay perdu on a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; - Dr. Tischendorf, that it had been deposited in a waste-paper basket in the convent of S. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai, - from which he rescued it on the 4<sup>th</sup> February 1859: - neither, we venture to think, a very likely circumstance. We incline to believe that the Author of Scripture hath not by any means shown Himself so unmindful of the safety of the Deposit, as those distinguished gentlemen imagine.*

*“Are we asked for the ground of our opinion? We point without hesitation to the 998 Copies which remain: to the many ancient Versions; to the many venerable Fathers, - any one of whom we hold to be a more trustworthy authority for the Text of Scripture, where he speaks out plainly, than either Codex B or Codex Aleph, - aye, or than both of them put together. Behold, (we say,) the abundant provision which the All-wise One hath made for the safety of the Deposit...We hope to be forgiven if we add, (not without a little warmth,) that we altogether wonder at the perversity, the infatuation, the blindness, - which is prepared to make light of all these precious helps, in order to magnify two of the most corrupt codices in existence.”*

So James White’s assessment of Aleph as “a great treasure” is found by a true scholar to be “perversity...infatuation...blindness.”

Burgon pointedly addressed his evaluation of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus to Bishop Ellicott, Chairman of the Revision Committee<sup>13 p 376, 397</sup>.

*“If I have sometimes spoken of certain famous manuscripts (Aleph, B, C, D namely,) as exhibiting fabricated Texts, have I not been at the pains to establish the reasonableness of my assertion by showing that they yield divergent, - that is contradictory, testimony?”*

*“The task of laboriously collating the five ‘old uncials’ throughout the Gospels, occupied me for five-and-a-half years, and taxed me severely. But I was rewarded. I rose from the investigation profoundly convinced that, however important they may be as instruments of Criticism, codices Aleph, B, C, D are among the most corrupt documents extant. It was a conviction derived from exact Knowledge and based on solid grounds of Reason. You, my Lord Bishop, who have never gone deeply into the subject, repose simply on Prejudice. Never having at any time collated codices Aleph, B, C, D for yourself, you are unable to gainsay a single statement of mine by a counter-appeal to facts. Your textual learning proves to have been all obtained at second-hand, - taken on trust. And so, instead of marshalling against me a corresponding array of Ancient Authorities, - you invariably attempt to put me down by an appeal to Modern Critics.”*



This is precisely what James White does<sup>3 p 40</sup>. He states “*Dr. A. T. Robertson indicated that areas of real concern regarding textual variants amounted to but “a thousandth part of the entire text” ...Dr. B. B. Warfield could state that “the great mass of the New Testament...has been transmitted to us with no, or next to no variations.” As Dr. Gordon Fee put it, “It is noteworthy that for most scholars over 90 percent of all the variations to the NT text are resolved, because in most instances the variant that best explains the origin of the others is also supported by the earliest and best witnesses.”*”

So why, according to the NIV Preface is “*the work of translation...never wholly finished*”?

So why was it necessary for Westcott and Hort to alter the New Testament in 5,337 places – see Wilkinson’s remarks under ***Catholic Allies and the Oxford Movement***- or almost one change in every verse, given that, according to White<sup>3 p 39</sup>, they left the text “*98.33 percent pure*”? If seven-eighths of the changes they introduced were, as White indicates, “*trivialities*,” why make them at all, when in the words of Bishop Ellicott<sup>13 p 368</sup>, “*We may be satisfied with the attempt to correct plain and clear errors but there it is our duty to stop*”?

Since when have “*trivialities*” become “*plain and clear errors*”?

So why doesn’t White explain what are “*the areas of real concern*” and specify which are “*the earliest and best witnesses*”?

And why doesn’t White clarify the obvious inconsistency between “*over 90 percent*” and “*next to no variation*” or “*a thousandth part of the entire text*”? White himself alludes to up to 252 verses which he thinks merit attention for the differences between the AV1611 and the modern versions. See ***Appendix, Tables A1, A5***. That is 3% of the New Testament, considerably more than “*a thousandth part*.” Moreover, Moorman<sup>9</sup> cites 356 doctrinal passages where serious differences exist between the AV1611 and the NIV. That is over 4% of the New Testament. It was published 5 years before White’s book. Why has White ignored it?

This author has remarked on the ‘percent change’ deception<sup>8 p 105-6, 140-1, 210-11</sup> and believes that concerned layman, J. Coad provides an incisive evaluation.

*“Is it true that there is only a 3% difference...? Yes! It is true. And that 3% makes all the difference! It is “the jam in the sandwich!” It means, for certain, that 17 complete verses belong to the New Testament, as in the Received Text (AV) or otherwise they don’t, as in the NIV. It means, again, the 147 part verses missing from the NIV should be missing - or they should not be missing. It means that a certain 169 names of Our Lord God, retained in the AV are correct, or that they should be omitted, as in the NIV! It means that the words “The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost” was either spoken by the Saviour Himself, as recorded in the AV (Matt. 18:11) or otherwise were not spoken by Him, as is missing in the NIV!*

*“Yet wait...consider these NIV 3% short measures. They are not short measures of any secular book out of Egypt. They are part of the sacred measures of the “Shekel of the Sanctuary”!...we demand full measure after “the Shekel of the Sanctuary”! A 97% salvation is no salvation, and a 97% Bible is not God’s Book. It has no place in the Sanctuary!”*

Cloud has this comment<sup>6 Part 3</sup>.

*“White alleges that the difference between the received text and the modern critical text is not very serious.*

*“White downplays the differences and gives statistics from Westcott and Hort to prove his point (p. 39). The fact is that Dr. Donald Waite has personally and painstakingly compared the Westcott-Hort text and the United Bible Societies text with the Received Text word for word, and he has published his findings. He does not base his conclusions on someone else’s statistics. He charges Westcott and Hort and other modern version proponents, such as the editor of the New International Version, with misstating the facts. Waite writes, “Hort’s 1/1000th of the Greek N.T. that he thought could be called ‘substantial variation’ would be 140.5 Greek words (.1%=.647 pages). This would be a little over one half a page in the Greek New Testament. This is extremely wide of the mark of truth! ... The truth of the matter is that there is a 7% difference ... This would be 45.9 pages. This is a most serious error” (Waite, *The Four-fold Superiority of the King James Bible*).”*

Dr Ruckman states<sup>1 p 61, 296</sup>.

*“Parroting Hort again, White tells us that only one-eighth of the variants have any “weight.” “This would leave the text (he didn’t say which text) 98.33% pure no matter whether one used the Textus Receptus or their own [Hort’s] Greek text”...So Westcott and Hort proceeded to make 5,337 changes in the Greek text. There are only 7,959 verses in the New Testament. That is better than one change per two verses: [67%], 5,337 is 1.67% of 7,959 according to Westcott and Hort. (Tell your public accountant or your tax auditor that and see if he can spot a lying crook even if you can’t)...The RV produced by Hort from his corrupt Roman Catholic Vaticanus, omitted eighteen words from one verse (Rom. 11:6); fifteen more from Romans 14:6; twelve more from Romans 16:24; and then thirty-five from John 5:4; plus seven from John 5:3; and sixteen from John 9:56. Of twenty words omitted from the book of Colossians, five were warnings to attend to the ministry (Col. 4:17). Every omission was “necessary” according to Hort.*

*“Of the 181,253 English words in the King James Bible [New Testament], the NIV, recommended by James White, altered 50% of them [omitting a total of 5,245 – see below]. Every change is said to be either an improvement or a legitimate substitution, or an unintentional error [i.e. not conspiratorial], according to James White...”*

*“In Luke’s Gospel...Hort and his clandestine liars made 836 Greek textual corrections in [a total of] 1,150 verses...He altered more than 50% of the verses in the Gospel of Luke.*

*“This was the same depraved, godless scoundrel whom White quotes as saying that only one-eighth of the variants (Textus Receptus vs. Nestle) had any “weight,” the rest “being trivialities”...so Hort made a 51% change in Luke, alone. That is, he violated his own terms for service (“to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the AV consistent with faithfulness”) and never winked or blushed. Do you call a 51% alteration “one thousandth part of the text?” White does. Would you say that if you perverted half of John’s Gospel that it was “no, or next to no variants?” White does. He cites two Scholarship Only fanatics for his sources: A. T. Robertson and Benjamin Warfield. Lying again, eh Jimmy?”*

50% alterations in the New Testament, including 5,245 words omitted, is hardly the same as “98.33% pure,” especially when many of the alterations affect major doctrine. See later for Dr Ruckman’s more detailed analysis.

White provides no answer to these observations. He has failed completely to address the impurity of the alleged “earliest and best witnesses” that Burgon researched and once again displays both his inconsistency and rank duplicity.

Burgon issued the following challenge to Ellicott.

*“For my part, I make no secret of the fact that I look upon the entire speculation about which you are so enthusiastic, as an excursion into cloud-land: a dream and nothing more. My contention is, - NOT that the Theory of Drs Westcott and Hort rests on an IN-SECURE foundation, but, that it rests on NO FOUNDATION AT ALL. Moreover, I am greatly mistaken if this has not been demonstrated in the foregoing pages. On one point, at all events, there cannot exist a particle of doubt...You must either come forward at once, and bring it to a successful issue [i.e. prove Westcott and Hort’s theory]; or else, you must submit to be told that you have suffered defeat, inasmuch as you are inextricably involved in Westcott and Hort’s discomfiture. You are simply without remedy. You may “find nothing in the Reviewer’s [i.e. Burgon’s] third article to require a further answer;” but readers of intelligence will tell you that your finding, since it does not proceed from stupidity, can only result from your consciousness that you have made a serious blunder: and that now, the less you say about “Westcott and Hort’s new textual Theory,” the better.”*

Ellicott never answered Burgon’s challenge. White has never seriously answered any of his critics either, not in the ten years since Dr Ruckman published his refutation of White’s book as *The Scholarship-Only Controversy*.

As for Sinaiticus not being “demonic,” White needs to review Burgon’s summary analysis. See remarks under **White’s Introduction**. Again, White would receive enlightenment from Gail Riplinger’s research<sup>14 p 557ff</sup>, if he didn’t hold both her and it in such contempt.

She states.

*“Sinaiticus (Aleph) adds two books after Revelation, both written in the same handwriting as the remainder...These two books, The Shepherd of Hermas and The Epistle of Barnabus, spell out in detail the entire New Age scenario, including commands to do the things God specifically forbids, such as:*

1. *Take ‘the name’ of the beast.*
2. *Give ‘up to the beast’.*
3. *Form a one world government.*
4. *Kill those not receiving his ‘name’.*
5. *Worship female virgins.*
6. *Receive ‘another spirit’.*
7. *Seek power.*
8. *Believe that God is immanent in his creation, as a pantheistic, monistic Hindu god.*
9. *Avoid marriage; permit fornication.*
10. *Abstain from fasting.*
11. *Subscribe to the New Age Root Race Theory.*
12. *Be saved by being baptized and keeping the ‘twelve’ mandates of the Antichrist.”*

*“If, after reading the following pages, the reader finds manuscript Aleph to be ‘most reliable,’ ‘accurate,’ ‘preferred,’ ‘the most highly valued,’ and of ‘pre-eminent excellence,’ as new version editors assert, then I’ve got a membership card for you in the Ghostly Guild too.”*

What follows are some of extracts from *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Epistle of Barnabas* given in *New Age Versions*, together in turn with Dr Mrs Riplinger's scriptural comments. With his admiration for Sinaiticus, White should exercise his<sup>3 p 95</sup> "*individual responsibility*" by adding these apocryphal portions to his DIY 'bible' – and apply for membership of "*the Ghostly Guild.*"

"*Whoever shall not receive His name shall not enter the kingdom of God.*"

"*Rev. 13:16, 17 says the Antichrist will cause "all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."*

"*The seal then is the water; so they go down into the water dead, and they come up alive.*"

"*Baptism, as an initiation rite of the New Age is discussed fully in chapter 14 [New Age Versions]; Apostate Christianity, along with 'ancient mystery cults,' believe baptism itself imparts spiritual life.*

"*These twelve tribes which inhabit the whole world are twelve nations.*"

"*The New Age scenario calls for a one world government 'divided' into twelve segments. (See Vera Alder's When Humanity Comes of Age.) Also see Dan. 11:39 where the Antichrist will "divide the land for gain."*

"*I took courage and gave myself up to the beast.*"

"*Giving up to the beast is in opposition to Rev. 15:2 which says Christians "had gotten the victory over the beast...having the harps of God."*

"*But some repented and believed and submitted themselves to those that had understanding...but if not, ye shall be delivered unto him to be put to death.*"

"*Rev. 20:4 says, "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." Jesus said the Antichrist "shall cause them to be put to death," Mark 13:12.*

"*But the other which...have not received the seal have been replaced...their possessions must be cut off them. The Lord dwelleth in men that love peace, for to him peace is dear, but from the contentious...this thy deed punish thee with death.*"

"*Rev. 13:16, 17 says "And he caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark" Daniel 8 and 11 say, "He shall enter peaceably...he shall scatter among them the...spoil and riches and by peace shall destroy many...But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver."*

The following is from the *Epistle of Barnabus*, with Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments.

"*The Black One is crooked and full of a curse. Offer resistance that the Black One may not effect an entrance.*"

"*New Age Root Race theory teaches that Christians, Jews, and certain 'dark' races are the 'Black Lodge.' In reference to this group, the New Age 'Great invocation' prays, "seal the door where evil dwells."*

“*“Satan...is Lord” (Ch. 68)*”

*“2 Corinthians 4:4 says Satan is the “god (small g) of this world.” 1 Corinthians 8:5 says “[T]here be gods many and lords many.” 1 Timothy 6:15 says Jesus Christ is “Lord of lords” (small l for the false ‘lords’). Satan can never be Lord (capital L).”*

And James White would have his readers believe that Sinaiticus is not “*demonic*”!

And while criticising the AV1611 for alleged additions, White says nothing about the additions to Sinaiticus of entire books that are clearly blasphemous and demonic and declares Aleph to be “*a great treasure.*” Moreover, he shows<sup>3 p 96ff</sup> that he has read *New Age Versions* but does not dispute Mrs Riplinger’s information about *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Epistle of Barnabas*.

Once again, he reveals his own inconsistency and double standards, of which he repeatedly accuses bible believers. See remarks under **Chapter 2 – ‘If It Ain’t Broke...’** and **White’s Introduction**.

Attention is again drawn to White’s insistence that the manuscripts underlying the AV1611 and in turn the AV1611 itself include<sup>3 p 37-8, 43, 46, 153, 177</sup> “*expansion(s) of piety*” and “*harmonisation*” – see above.

White raises the question in this context<sup>3 p 38</sup>, “*The fact that all modern translations have “and the Lord Jesus Christ” at Ephesians 1:2 should certainly cause us to question anyone who would ask us to believe that there is some evil conspiracy at work behind the non-inclusion of the same phrase at Colossians 1:2. If someone is tampering with the texts, why not take out the phrase at Ephesians 1:2?*”

White forgot that “*a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*” 1 Corinthians 5:6b and that “*the little foxes...spoil the vines*” Song of Solomon 2:15, that is, the little changes, the little omissions, like “*freely*” in Genesis 3:2.

His question is very like the attitude of the academic critic this author dealt with some years ago<sup>3 p 99-100</sup>.

*“You overlook the fact that the critics...leave so much in the text which stands in complete contradiction to their alleged purposes.”*

Both he and White promoted the ‘Somewhere’ Version, that is, if a phrase occurs somewhere in scripture, e.g. Ephesians 1:2, it can be safely omitted from another passage where it occurs in the AV1611. (No scripture is ever advanced to substantiate this arbitrary approach.)

The same answers are forthcoming.

Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 211</sup>: “*90% of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus...have to read with the Byzantine Family IN ORDER TO PASS OFF AS BIBLES*”.

Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger<sup>14 p 499</sup>: “*a large part of even new versions must contain the traditional bible readings in order to be sold as ‘bibles’*”.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon<sup>42</sup>: “*It is sadly common among ministers to add a word or subtract a word from the passage, or in some way debase the language of sacred writ...Our reverence for the Great Author of Scripture should forbid all mauling of His Words.*”

***“Thus saith the LORD; Stand in the court of the Lord’s house, and speak unto all the cities of Judah, which come to worship in the LORD’S house, all the words that I command thee to speak unto them; diminish not a word:”*** Jeremiah 26:2.

In addition, Dr Ruckman states<sup>1 p 98</sup>, “*This...is what Hort called “harmonising tendencies” in a “conflated text”...The warped logic behind this Disneyland scholarship is that it is not possible that any New Testament writer could record the identical words that another New Testament writer wrote. Everybody had to have borrowed from somebody else if they said the same thing. The background for this humanistic explanation goes back to the “Two-Document Theory” and the “Redactor” theories of unsaved German Rationalists (Lessing, Eichorn, Semler, Paulus, Ernesti, Graf, Wellhausen, Herder, Bauer, Strauss, et al.)*

*“This is how Jimmy attempted to alter Colossians 1:2 and Ephesians 1:2, and it is how he got rid of the BLOOD REDEMPTION in Colossians 1:14. Following the Alexandrian tradition of his hogtied slaves to traditionalism (Hort, etc.), Jimmy believed in omitting as many words (or verses) in his Fairy Tale for Bible Believers. Dean Burgon said the man who pushed [this] idea (Hort) was judging manuscript evidence by his own “INDIVIDUAL IDIOSYNCRACY”<sup>13 p 307</sup>. Hort’s (and White’s) approach to modern versions since 1881 (and “God’s truth”) was accompanied by a boundless exercise of the IMAGINATIVE FACULTY”<sup>13 p 304</sup>. ”*

To downplay the corruptions of Aleph and B, reproduced in modern versions like the NIV, NRSV, White then maintains<sup>3 p 38-9</sup> that “*ten people in a room*” could “*copy the first five chapters of the Gospel of John*” from which, in spite of variants, “*you would...by comparing all ten copies you could rather easily reproduce the text of the original, because when one person makes a mistake, the other nine are not likely to do so at the very same spot.*”

Dr Ruckman states in response<sup>1 p 219-220</sup> “*The copies of John...are more than ten; they were not done at the same time; they were not done in the same room, and (after comparing all of their variants) no scholar, or Bible committee, has yet produced ONE perfect copy of John [since 1611]. They revised each other 200 times in 100 years and are still revising each other.*

*“That isn’t all...two people in the room [Aleph and B] omitted more than 300 words\* from the Gospel of John and when HE (James White) examined the “copies” to “EASILY reproduce the original” he used those two manuscripts for judging the eight other copies...That is exactly what the NIV and NASV did: and those are the most glaring imperfect revelations of God that White could set out to justify\*\*.*

*“How do you reproduce the text of the “original”...when no text is even present? An omission is not a “variant.” At this point White repeats the outworn, meaningless cliché: “Only 1/1000<sup>th</sup> part of the entire text”\*\*\*... Warfield’s inane comment is added. He says that the 1,000 important variants that need to be changed are “NO, or less than NO variants at all”...Try Warfield the next time you are making out your income tax form, or balancing your bank account: “\$1,000 equals nothing, or next to NO dollars.””*

In sum, White’s analogy is misleading and the changes significantly weaken major doctrine. See Dr Ruckman’s analysis after Dr Holland’s comments.

\*The NIV omits a total of 64,098 words of scripture, including 495 words omitted from the Gospel of John<sup>44</sup>.

\*\*Remember that<sup>38</sup> “*James White is a consultant to the NASB revision, and therefore has a financial relationship with the Lockman Foundation.*” See comments from site inserted near the beginning of this chapter.

\*\*\*An AV1611 New Testament contains 180,392 words<sup>44</sup> - 181,253<sup>45</sup>. The NIV omits 5,245 words and will therefore affect 3% of the Text, by deletion. Even if less than the 7% variation between the text of Westcott and Hort and the United Bible Societies text versus the Received Text, according to Waite's calculations – see Cloud's comments above - this is *far in excess* of 1/1000<sup>th</sup> part. See also Coad's comments above.

But White goes on to try to justify the kind of omission found in the modern renderings of Colossians 1:2 and based on Aleph and B as follows<sup>3 p 39-40</sup>.

*“Philip Schaff [American Standard Version editor<sup>14 p 457</sup>, the ASV being the American equivalent of the RV] estimated that...not one [textual variant] affected “an article of faith or a precept of duty which is not abundantly sustained by other and undoubted passages, or by the whole tenor of Scripture teaching”...The reality is that the amount of variation between the two most extremely different manuscripts of the New Testament would not fundamentally alter the message of the scriptures!...No textual variants in either the Old or New Testaments in any way, shape, or form materially disrupt or destroy any essential doctrine of the Christian faith. That is a fact that any semi-impartial review will substantiate.”*

Several questions immediately spring to mind, none of which White even addresses, let alone answers.

1. By what authority did Philip Schaff, who was tried for heresy by the Pennsylvania Synod<sup>14 p 458-9</sup>, determine which scriptures should be reckoned as “undoubted”?
2. Is “*the whole tenor of Scripture teaching*” White’s “*highest standard of truth*” and who does the teaching – an Episcopalian ally of Westcott and Hort who was tried for heresy, rejected what he termed “*the moonshine theory of the inerrant apostolic autographs*,” allied himself with a Unitarian member of his ASV committee, by which he masterminded 30,000 departures from the AV1611 Text and in 1893, convened the first ever, multi-faith Parliament of World Religions, the forerunner of the New Age Movement?
3. What are “*the two most extremely different manuscripts of the New Testament*” and how do they differ? Again, White should check Moorman’s work<sup>9</sup>.
4. Is “*the message of the scriptures*” White’s “*highest standard of truth*,” who delivers it and what is the unequivocal source of “*the scriptures*” upon which that message is authoritatively based?
5. What *is* this alleged “*message*” and why does White insist that only this “*message*” is essential, when the Lord Jesus Christ exhorted His followers to keep “*my words*,” John 14:23, not merely a “*message*”?
6. The AV1611 reading for Colossians 1:2 amply satisfies Burgon’s Seven Tests of Truth<sup>8 p 43, 9 p 131, 10</sup>. It has wide-ranging support, including the Old Latin and is even found in White’s<sup>3 p 33</sup> “*great treasure*” Aleph, or Codex Sinaiticus. Like all AV1611 readings, God has honoured it for 400 years and it is found in the Bibles of Wycliffe, Tyndale and the Geneva. What actual evidence, instead of sheer conjecture, can White produce to refute the conclusion that the reading is genuine?
7. The AV1611 reading for Colossians 1:2 is found in Wycliffe’s<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale’s<sup>47</sup>, Matthew’s<sup>48</sup> and the Geneva New Testaments<sup>49</sup>. What evidence can White produce to show that these faithful witnesses were deceived, while Watchtower (NWT) and latter-day popes (JB) were correct in omitting the clause?

8. If “*no textual variants... materially disrupt or destroy any essential doctrine of the Christian faith,*” why did Rome - and later Watchtower - develop such heretical doctrines as the papacy<sup>15</sup> and salvation by works<sup>50</sup> (sacraments in Catholicism), given that most “*textual variants*” or departures from the AV1611 come from Catholic manuscripts?
9. And why did Rome wage such fierce wars of extermination against true bible believers like the Waldenses? See Wilkinson’s remarks, especially those under ***Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare.***
10. And why, since the rejection of the AV1611 in favour of the RV and subsequent modern versions, has the Church of England so departed from “***the good and the right way***” 1 Samuel 12:23, that the then Archbishop of Canterbury, the late Robert Runcie, welcomed the papal antichrist to Britain in 1982<sup>51</sup> and the national church has continued to engage with Rome in the Ecumenical Movement<sup>52</sup> and even appointed\* its first openly sodomite bishop<sup>53</sup>?

\*This appointment has caused considerable division in the church that continues to the present, exacerbated by similar appointments in the Episcopal Church, which has also appointed a female bishop, contrary to scripture<sup>54</sup>, 1 Timothy 3:17.

Until James White can provide satisfactory answers to the above (and he won’t), his notions of “*harmonisation*” in the AV1611 and his assertions that “*no textual variants...materially disrupt or destroy any essential doctrine of the Christian faith*” must be dismissed as yet more dissimulation, after the style of his spiritual mentor.

**“*Yea, hath God said?*”** Genesis 3:1.

Further, although White professes to believe in the preservation of scripture<sup>3 p 47</sup>, he fails to explain why God, Whose words are “***purified seven times***” Psalm 12:6 so that His word is “***very pure***” Psalm 119:140, did not purge supposedly manmade additions to the manuscripts in the form of “*expansions of piety*” and “*harmonisation*” but instead allowed them to proliferate over such a wide geographical area, while keeping supposedly “*great treasure(s)*” like Aleph and B hidden for centuries. See Wilkinson’s remarks under ***Early Conspirators and Corrupters*** and Burgon’s above on “*the Truth of Scripture.*” See also remarks under ***Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness*** – and note that even AV1611 readings such as found in Matthew 4:18 and Acts 15:11 that are not part of the Majority Text\* have wide geographical attestation.

\*The so-called Majority Text is actually von Soden’s 1913 collation of 414 manuscripts<sup>11 p 14-15</sup> out of 88 papyri, 274 uncials and 2,700 cursives, not including 2,143 lectionaries or “*the vast field of Patristic and Versional evidence.*” Von Soden therefore collated only about 8% of available Greek sources and according to Moorman<sup>11 p 11</sup> was “*strongly Alexandrian*” so that he deliberately selected manuscripts that exhibited Alexandrian corruptions. A full collation of the evidence, therefore, could well transform so-called ‘minority’ readings in the AV1611 to ‘majority’ readings and Moorman’s compilation must be considered a ‘worst case’ scenario – though not from a bible-believing perspective because God has consistently honoured ALL AV1611 readings, regardless of majority or minority manuscript support. (Later sources give slightly higher figures than Moorman’s for the Greek manuscript totals<sup>8 p 5</sup>.)

Dr Holland<sup>4</sup> has this penetrating comment about White’s notion<sup>3 p 38</sup> that omission of the phrase “***and the Lord Jesus Christ***” in Colossians 1:2 of the modern versions is not “*an example of an attempt to downgrade the lordship of Jesus Christ.*”



“White also advocates his idea of “expression of piety” (pp. 43, 45, 46). Simply put, the Greek text of the KJV is “fuller” because it uses expanded titles in reference to Jesus Christ. White notes twenty-three examples of where “He” becomes “Jesus”, “The Lord” becomes “The Lord Jesus”, or where “Jesus Christ” becomes “The Lord Jesus Christ.” This “expansion of piety,” White concludes, “led people to naturally expand the titles used of the Lord, possibly even without their conscious effort to change the text” (p. 46). What evidence does White offer for this “expansion of piety” theory? He gives an example of a caller who phoned in while he was on the radio and complained that he should use the phrase “The Lord Jesus Christ” instead of “Jesus.” Does modern scholarship now consist of proof by radio?

“This “expansion of piety” is not limited to 23 cases. The Greek texts of the United Bible Society differs from the TR 212 times on this issue of the names of God. The NIV omits the name 173 times while the ASV does so 210 times. Since the scriptures teach us “that in all things He might have the pre-eminence” (Col. 1:18), it makes sense to use a Bible with the “expansion of piety” than to have one where Christ is not as prevalent.”

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 49</sup> adds with respect to the term “expansion of piety” that “Dr James R. White...suggests that when these terms are found in the Traditional Text individuals added them over time as a sign of reverence...However, the evidence from the early fathers allows us to understand that these extended titles were in common use shortly after the completion of the New Testament and before the establishment of the Alexandrian text-type that generally shortens these titles.”

In other words, the truth is the reverse of what White suggests.

In response to an enquirer stating that, “It’s true that my Bible is lacking phrases of the Lord’s prayer in Luke. But this fact does not discount the validity of the entire translation. In fact, Matthew 6:9-13 contains a more complete version of Jesus’ prayer...I am concerned that you seem to discredit other translations of the Bible solely on the fact that certain clauses are not found in specific scripture passages,” Daniels writes<sup>43 p 133-5</sup>, “There is a key here. Please notice the words “lacking” and “not found.” God said **“My words shall not pass away”** (Mark 13:31) and **“thou shalt preserve them** (God’s words) **from this generation for ever”** (Psalm 12:7). Since God promised to preserve His words, it should arouse our curiosity when we find that words, phrases, even whole verses are missing from the Bible...as you keep removing words from verses about vital doctrines (the godhead, trinity, salvation, Jesus Christ as God, hell, fasting, prayer, adultery, sodomy, etc.) you will have a problem. God repeats Himself to emphasise vital doctrines. Modern Bibles take away many places where God says the same thing again. Thus modern Bibles make it look like those doctrines weren’t so important to God.”

Such as is implied with respect to grace and peace from the Lord Jesus Christ by omission of **“and the Lord Jesus Christ”** from Colossians 1:2.

It should be noted that the modern versions, DR, RV, NIV, JB, NWT and Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition unite in omitting **“For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen”** from Matthew 6:13 and much of Luke 11:2, 4, undermining both versions of the Lord’s Prayer<sup>8 p 58-60, 70-1</sup> in the face of overwhelming evidence in support of the AV1611 readings. See also **Appendix, Table A1**.

Dr Ruckman has a penetrating study on the bald assertions of White and Schaff, together with Westcott, Hort, Robertson and Fee – see earlier – as follows<sup>56</sup>. Note many of the following verses are compared for the AV1611 versus the other versions in the **Appendix** and elsewhere<sup>8, p 57ff, 258ff, 294ff, 331, 339; 9</sup>.

*“Matthew 5:22. Once you remove **“without a cause,”** you imply that Jesus Christ was a sinner...*

*“Matthew 6:13. When you remove the ending you have taken the glory from God for bringing in a literal, physical kingdom on this earth...*

*Matthew 19:16-17. The “newer” translations totally erase the reference to the Deity of Christ: **“Why callest thou me good?”** This is the first Fundamental of the Faith, according to all “Fundamentalists.”*

*“Mark 1:2. By altering **“prophets”** (Malachi and Isaiah) to Isaiah – who did not author the quotation (vs. 2) – the Deity of Christ was obscured, for the quote is Malachi’s and Malachi said the “Me” of Mark 1:2 is Jehovah (Mal. 3:1). Thus a direct attack on the Deity of Jesus Christ is accomplished by purposely lying about the source of a quotation.*

*“John 3:13. The only reference in the New Testament on Christ’s omnipresence. The key words are missing from all new translations, and none of them can show you this basic, Fundamental Bible Doctrinal truth in any other verse in their translations...*

*“2 Timothy 2:15. Only the King James has a verse in it telling you to study the word of God. No other Bible wants you to study the Bible... Note also that 2 Corinthians 2:17 is the only verse of scripture explicitly to warn against the many who **“corrupt the word of God”** and 1 Timothy 6:20 is the only verse explicitly<sup>33 p 7</sup> to warn against **“science falsely so called,”** like evolution or alleged ‘global warming.’*

*“Matthew 22:30. What is **“of God”** doing missing from the text? The angels that are not “of God” fell (Gen. 6, 2 Pet. 2) and will fall again (Rev. 12:7). Do you mean to tell me these blockheads thought the Devil didn’t have any angels (Rev. 12:9)?*

*“Matthew 26:28. What is “new” doing, being absent from the text? Do you mean to tell me Christ’s blood did not institute a New Testament? Do you think this affects a fundamental New Testament truth?*

*“Mark 4:24. It is a Bible truth that if you seek truth, you will be given more truth (John 7:17, 3:21). What is the reason for eliminating **“and unto you that hear shall more be given”**?”*

In Mark 4:24, the AV1611 has **“and unto you that hear shall more be given.”** According to Berry’s 1897 Edition of Stephanus’s 1550 Edition of the Greek Received Text, which contains the clause, Griesbach omits it entirely. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford omit **“that hear”** as does Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition. The JR, DR, RV, NRSV, NWT read **“and more shall be given to you,”** or similar, also omitting **“that hear.”** The NIV, JB read **“and even more,”** omitting yet more of the clause. The NKJV retains the clause but neglects to inform the reader that Nestle’s text omits **“that hear.”**

*“Mark 10:24. Why do the new versions want to teach that you can trust in riches and enter the Kingdom, just as long as you don’t have them (vs. 23)? It is **“the love of money”** that destroys sinners (1 Tim. 6:10) not having money...*

*“Luke 2:33. Why are you led to believe that Joseph was Christ’s real father, thus denying the Virgin Birth? Why take a Bible that states the Virgin Birth (Matt. 1:20) and then denies it (Luke 2:33 and Acts 4:27), when you can get a Bible that confirms it in all three passages (Matt. 1:20; Acts 4:27; and Luke 2:33)?*

*“Luke 4:4. Who is it that doesn’t believe you need **“every word”** of God? Easy, the dirty, God-forsaken, destructive critics who altered 30,000 to 65,000 words in the Scriptures. But **“no fundamental of the faith”** is destroyed?*

*“John 1:18. Two gods? One begotten and the other “unbegotten”? Why that is Arianism from A.D. 325. No one can “begat” God. The Trinitarian statement for 1,800 years was “One God, manifest in three persons,” not two Gods – one begotten and the other unbegotten! This does not concern a “fundamental” of the faith?”*

*“Colossians 1:14. If you omit “through his blood” you teach heresy: “redemption” is not “remission” (see Exod. 34:7; Heb. 9:15; Rom. 3:25).”*

In addition to these 14 examples, Dr Ruckman alludes to 10 more; Ephesians 1:6, Revelation 20:12, 1 John 4:19, 2 Peter 2:17, 1 Timothy 3:3, 6:5, 19, 1 Thessalonians 1:1, Galatians 4:7, 1 Corinthians 11:29. Alteration or omission of words found in the AV1611 detract from, delete or obscure major doctrine on:

- The Christian’s standing in Christ
- The unsaved dead standing before God
- Loving God
- Eternal damnation for false prophets
- Eternal life
- Greed and love of money
- Eternal inheritance
- Taking the Lord’s Supper unworthily

Dr Ruckman cites Dr Edward F. Hills as follows<sup>1 p 111, 113</sup>, *““It is NOT true that there are no various readings which involve cardinal Christian doctrines. On the contrary, in the handful of dissenting manuscripts there are a HOST of corrupt readings which ALL bring into question such doctrines as the essential GODHEAD of CHRIST.*

*““Instead of repeating parrot-like the statement that it makes no difference for doctrine which of the New Testament manuscripts one chooses to follow, those who LOVE EVERY WORD THAT GOD HAS SPOKEN should take the very OPPOSITE COURSE.””*

Emphases are Dr Ruckman’s.

White vigorously attacks<sup>3 p 109ff</sup> Dr Ruckman but in doing so starkly betrays his own superficiality compared with Dr Ruckman’s command of the scriptures.

White then focuses<sup>3 p 43-45</sup> on *“Text-Types and Families.”* He states *“The Alexandrian [manuscript family] is the more “concise,” while the Byzantine [manuscript family] is the “full” text...Most scholars today (in opposition to the KJV Only advocates) would see the Alexandrian text-type as representing an earlier, and hence more accurate, form of text than the Byzantine text-type. Most believe the Byzantine represents a later period in which readings from other text-types were put together (“conflated”) into the reading of the Byzantine text. This is not to say that the Byzantine does not contain some distinctive readings that are quite ancient, but that the readings that are unique to that text-type are generally secondary or later readings. Since the Byzantine comes from a later period (the earliest are almost all Alexandrian in nature, not Byzantine), it is “fuller” in the sense that it not only contains conflations of other text-types, but it gives evidence of what might be called the “expansion of piety.” That is, additions have been made to the text that flow from a desire to protect and reverence divine truths.”*

Note that White does not attempt to substantiate any of the above statements. They are mere assertions. He does not, indeed cannot, show why the Alexandrian text is “*more accurate*” and is unable to prove even that it is “*earlier*” than the Byzantine.

Even his notion of “*text-types*” cannot be validated.

It was the unregenerate German higher critic, J. J. Griesbach<sup>8 p 121</sup>, who invented the so-called ‘family’ and ‘text-type’ classifications. These classifications never existed as such in history, as indicated by these extracts from this author’s more detailed summary<sup>8 p 120ff</sup>.

Dr Ruckman states “[*The theory*] propounded in 1881 by Dean Burgon...matches ALL THE FACTS OF HISTORY, ALL THE EVIDENCE OF THE PYPYRUS, ALL THE EVIDENCE FOUND IN THE UNCIALS, AND ALL THE EVIDENCES OF SOUL WINNING AND REVIVAL, AND ALL THE EVIDENCES OF COMMON SENSE AND REASON, THAT THE SYRIAN TEXT WAS FIRST, AND THE ALEXANDRIAN SCRIBES SUBTRACTED FROM IT (ASV, RSV) AND THE ROMAN SCRIBES ADDED TO IT (VULGATE, DOUAY-RHEIMS). This theory, supported by Scrivener, Miller, and Hills, tallies perfectly with EVERYTHING.”

Wilbur Pickering states ““Hort felt that the genealogical method enabled him to reduce the mass of manuscript testimony to four voices - “Neutral,” “Alexandrian,” “Western”, and “Syrian”. Though such classifications have been generally “recognised” since Hort’s day, they have never been demonstrated to be valid. The Papyri have obliged recent scholarship to reconsider them and have increasingly vindicated Burgon’s remonstrance. M.M Parvis complains:

““We have reconstructed text-types and families and sub-families and in doing so have created things that never before existed on earth or in heaven...”

“Allen Wikgren shows that sweeping generalizations about text-types in general, and the “Byzantine” text and lectionaries in particular, should no longer be made. Colwell affirms:

““The major mistake is made in thinking of the “old text-types” as frozen blocks, even after admitting that no one manuscript is a perfect witness to any text-type. IF no one ms. is a perfect witness to any type, then all witnesses are mixed in ancestry...””

John Burgon states ““The combined testimony of the Uncials and of the whole body of the Cursive Copies (shows) They are (a) dotted over at least 1000 years; (b) they evidently belong to so many divers countries, - Greece, Constantinople, Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Alexandria, and other parts of Africa, not to say Sicily, Southern Italy, Gaul, England and Ireland: (c) they exhibit so many strange characteristics and peculiar sympathies: (d) they so clearly represent countless families of mss., being in no single instance absolutely identical in their text, and certainly not being copies of any other Codex in existence...The advocates of the Traditional Text urge that the Consent without Concert of so many hundreds of copies, executed by different persons, at diverse times, in widely sundered regions of the church, is a proof presumptive of their trustworthiness, which nothing can invalidate...”

In other words, the notion of ‘text-types’ and manuscript ‘families’ as White asserts, such that the Byzantine manuscripts were ‘descended’ from the allegedly “*earlier...more accurate*” Alexandrian text-type and expanded “*to protect and reverence divine truths*” is rightly summed up by Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 255-6</sup> as “*MOONSHINE.*”

Dr Ruckman<sup>57 p 21</sup> cites Klijn as stating that “*It is still customary to divide manuscripts into the four well known families [as White does]...this classical division CAN NO*

*LONGER BE MAINTAINED*” Dr Ruckman’s emphasis. As Dr Ruckman summarised earlier, the Christians of Antioch, Syria<sup>8 p 9ff</sup>, “*where the disciples were called Christians first*,” Acts 11:26, preserved the words of scripture, now found in the majority of manuscripts, which were spread throughout the then-known world – see Wilkinson’s comments under *Early Conspirators and Corrupters* – and the scribes of Alexandria and later Rome, no doubt by means of “*a ship of Alexandria*” Acts 28:11 or several, corrupted them.

Simple, really.

Klijn’s statement was made in 1949. Where has White been all these years?

White’s false assumption of “*conflation of other text-types*” in the Byzantine or Majority Text has been discussed earlier. See comments under *Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness*. This was Hort’s theory that Burgon demonstrated was “*baseless*” and refutation of which has been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 44, 120ff</sup>. Extracts are as follows.

*“Hills states “Westcott and Hort found proof for their position that the Traditional Text was a “work of attempted criticism performed deliberately by editors and not merely by scribes” in eight passages in the Gospels in which the Western text contains one half of the reading found in the Traditional Text and the Alexandrian text in the other half. These passages are Mark 6:33, 8:26, 9:38, 9:49, Luke 9:10, 11:54, 12:18, 24:53...Dean Burgon immediately registered one telling criticism of this hypothesis of conflation in the Traditional Text...”Their theory has at last forced them to make an appeal to Scripture and to produce some actual specimens of their meaning. After ransacking the Gospels for 30 years, they have at last fastened upon EIGHT.”*

*“Hills reinforces the point: “If the Traditional Text was created by 4<sup>th</sup>-century Antiochan editors...surely more examples of such conflation ought to be discoverable in the Gospels than just Hort’s EIGHT.”*

*“Burgon’s analysis continues: “Drs. Westcott and Hort require us to believe that the authors of the (imaginary) Syrian Revisions of A.D. 250 and A.D. 350, interpolated the genuine text of the Gospels with between 2877 (B) and 3455 (Aleph) spurious words; mutilated the genuine text in respect of between 536 (B) and 839 (Aleph) words, substituted for as many genuine words, between 935 (B) and 1114 (Aleph) uninspired words, licentiously transposed between 2098 (B) and 2299 (Aleph); and in respect to number, case, mood, tense, person, etc., altered without authority between 1132 (B) and 1265 (Aleph) words... “The illustrious professor invites us to believe that the mistaken textual judgment pronounced at Antioch in A.D. 350 had an immediate effect on the text of Scripture throughout the world. We are requested to suppose that it resulted in the instantaneous extinction of codices like B Aleph, wherever found; and caused codices of the A type to spring up like mushrooms in their place, and that, in every library of ancient Christendom...We read and marvel!””*

White’s assertion that “*This is not to say that the Byzantine does not contain some distinctive readings that are quite ancient, but that the readings that are unique to that text-type are generally secondary or later readings*” is answered by Pickering<sup>8 p 126</sup>, in his assessment of Kenyon’s remarks about the Received Text that are the same as White’s.

*“[Kenyon] “According to Hort, the traditional text is the result of a revision in which old elements were incorporated; and Mr. Miller merely points to some of those old elements, and argues therefrom that the whole is old. It is clear that by such arguments Hort’s theory is untouched.”*

[Pickering] *“It is hard to believe that Kenyon was precisely honest here. He had obviously read Miller’s work with care. Why did he not say anything about “unto repentance” in Matt. 9:13 and Mark 2:17, or “vinegar” in Matt. 27:34, or “from the door” in Matt. 28:2, or “the prophets” in Mark 1:2, or “good will” in Luke 2:14, or the Lord’s prayer for His murderers in Luke 23:34, or “some honeycomb” in Luke 24:42, or “they” in John 17:24...these instances are also among “the thirty.” They would appear to be “strictly Syrian” readings, if there really is such a thing. Why did Kenyon ignore them? The cases Kenyon cites fell within the scope of Miller’s inquiry because they are Traditional readings, whatever other attestation they may also have, and because the English Revisers of 1881 rejected them. Kenyon asserted that Miller’s figures “cannot be accepted as representing in any way the true state of case,” but he has not shown us why.*

*“It is commonplace among the many who are determined to despise the “Byzantine” text to dodge the issue, as Kenyon did above. The postulates of Hort’s theory are assumed to be true and the evidence is interpreted on the basis of these presuppositions. Apart from the imaginary nature of the “Alexandrian” and “Western” texts, as strictly definable entities, their priority to the “Byzantine” text is the very point to be proved and may not be assumed.”*

Although White does.

See also this author’s summary<sup>8 p 129ff</sup> of the evidence of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century papyri, from which these extracts are taken.

*“Pickering says: “(Colwell) had said of the “Byzantine New Testament”, “Most of its readings existed in the second century.””*

This summary includes Colwell’s explanation of why the Byzantine text is in the words of White *“fuller.”*

*“Gail Riplinger writes<sup>14 p 468</sup>, “The late E. C. Colwell, past president of the University of Chicago and THE premier North American New Testament Greek scholar, authored scores of books, such as Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament. He confesses his ‘change of heart’ concerning the reliability of readings in the new versions (circa 1950)”.*

*““Scholars now believe that most errors were made deliberately. The majority of the variant readings in the New Testament were created for theological or dogmatic reasons. Most of the manuals and handbooks now in print (including mine!) will tell you that these variations were the fruit of careless treatment which was possible because the books of the New Testament had not yet attained a strong position as ‘Bible’. The reverse is the case. It was because they were the religious treasure of the church that they were changed...”*

*“Pickering again cites Colwell:*

*““It may be well to repeat Colwell’s statement noted above:*

*“““The Bodmer John (P66) is also a witness to the early existence of many of the readings found in the Alpha text-type (Hort’s “Syrian”). Strangely enough to our previous ideas, the contemporary corrections in that papyrus frequently change in Alpha-type reading to a Beta-type reading (Hort’s “Neutral”). This indicates that at this early period readings of both kinds were known, and the Beta-type were supplanting the Alpha-type - at least as far as this witness is concerned...”*

*“Pickering then cites H. M. Breidenthal who “gives the following results of a complete collation of B, Aleph, and the Textus Receptus against P66 in the 615 verses where it is extant. “The total number of variants from P66 for the manuscripts in increasing progression are, B with 589, Textus Receptus with 695, and Aleph with 864.” P66 is closer to the Textus Receptus than to the average of B and Aleph. Collating P66, Aleph, A, B, D with the Textus Receptus against P45 (Kenyon’s edition) in the 76 verses where all are extant, Breidenthal found the order based on number of variants in increasing progression to be - the T.R., B, Aleph, A, P66, D. In this small area P45 is closer to the T.R. than to B, Aleph, etc. All of this places quite a strain upon the view that the “Byzantine” text is late...””*

*“Riplinger<sup>14 p 483</sup>, states Pickering’s conclusion from the evidence of the papyri: “The TR has more early attestation than B and twice as much as Aleph - evidently the TR reflects an earlier text than either B or Aleph.””*

All of which puts “quite a strain” on White’s view of “*the Alexandrian text-type as representing an earlier, and hence more accurate, form of text than the Byzantine text-type.*”

An unbearable strain, actually. See also Moorman’s detailed summary<sup>9 p 16-17, 44</sup> showing that the papyri support the Received Text against the Alexandrian in 39 passages versus 182 for the 356 doctrinal passages that he reviews, or 18%, which is certainly appreciable and cannot be dismissed as mere “*old elements*” inasmuch as the 1881 revisers would have rejected them— see Pickering’s assessment of Kenyon’s opinion above. Moorman’s findings for the Old Latin and Syriac versions are 2:1 and 3:1 respectively for the Received Text against the Alexandrian, or AV1611 versus the NIV, underlining again that White’s opinion of the Received Text versus the Alexandrian is like Hort’s, resting, as Burgon demonstrated<sup>13 p 397</sup>, “*on no foundation at all.*”

Dr Ruckman answers<sup>1 p 204</sup> White’s assertions about “*expansions of piety*” as follows.

*“According to the documented evidence recorded by Miller, Sturz, Zuntz, Colwell, Pickering, Dean Burgon, and Scrivener, ‘Ignorance Aflame’ [James White] lied three times. The so-called “expansion of piety” is a hackneyed cliché for Griesbach’s canon which stated that “doctrinal passages are suspect.” This simply meant that passages that emphasised the DEITY of Christ were probably not “Scripture.”*

*“You see the Byzantine text honoured Jesus Christ; the Alexandrian “low-rated” Him. White wrote his book to prove that the Alexandrian text did NOT low rate Him.”*

See Dr Holland’s comments earlier.

White<sup>3 p 44</sup> attempts to dismiss the overwhelming number of Byzantine-type manuscripts by reference to “*Latin [superseding] Greek as the “language of the people” in the West*” so that “*the production of manuscripts in [Greek] will be less than if everyone is still speaking that language.*” He adds that “*the Muslim invasion of Palestine, then North Africa, and finally all the way into Spain and southern France [adversely affected] production of manuscripts in those areas... Given that these Christians [of Constantinople, also known as Byzantium] continued to write and use Greek ...while Greek had passed out of normal use throughout the rest of Europe and North Africa, the dominance of the text-type that is found in that area is easily understood.*”

No it isn’t. White’s remarks refer only the production of *manuscripts*.

They do *not* explain the overwhelming predominance of the Byzantine-type Received Text, which flourished both in the eastern portions of the Roman Empire and in the western, especially amongst the Waldenses of northern Italy and the Albigenses of southern

France, who endured centuries of persecution under “*the iron heel of the papacy.*” See Wilkinson’s remarks under *Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare.*

In addition, long before the Muslim invasion, Christians throughout the Empire suffered persecution by pre-papal emperors such as Diocletian, during the third and fourth centuries AD, one of whom was George of Lydda<sup>58</sup>, England’s Patron Saint, martyred at Nicomedia, now Izmit, located about 60 miles east of Istanbul, on April 23<sup>rd</sup> 304 AD.

Ward<sup>8 p 10</sup> also notes how long drawn out the persecution of Christians was in the east of the Empire, yet propagation of the Byzantine Received Text of Antioch, Syria nevertheless still far outstripped that of Alexandria, Egypt.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 534, 39 p 681</sup> states “*Emperor Diocletian had cleared the shelves, so to speak, of real bibles...For this reason, no early copies of the true Greek New Testament are extant today. Remaining only are the corrupted Egyptian papyri and their [descendants] Aleph and B (protected, like the Egyptian babies, from Pharaoh’s murder mandate against the seed of Abraham.) God has nonetheless preserved “the incorruptible seed, the word by which the gospel is preached unto you” (1 Peter 1:23-25), just as He protected Moses from Pharaoh and Christ from Herod.*”

White also forgets that despite the prevalence of Greek in the eastern portion of the Empire, both the Old Latin and the Peshitta (Peschito) Syrian translations were produced during the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century<sup>8 p 127-8, 9 p 28, 33, 13 p 9</sup>, well before Aleph and B were compiled and centuries before Greek ceased to be “*language of the people*” and these versions are staunch witnesses to the Received Text, not the Alexandrian allegedly “*earlier, and hence more accurate, form of text.*” See Moorman’s findings above.

White<sup>3 p 44</sup> then makes the bald assertion that “*KJV Only advocates...explain the lack of ancient examples of the Byzantine text-type by theorizing that those manuscripts “wore out” from excessive use over the years, while the “Alexandrian” texts were quickly seen as corrupt and hence just buried in the sand. Such a theory, of course, defies proof by its very nature.*”

Note first that White has confused “*text-type*” with “*manuscripts.*” Although extant Byzantine ‘manuscripts’ are more recent than the Alexandrian, their ‘text-type’ predates the Alexandrian. See citations above. As Wilkinson shows, “*These manuscripts have in agreement with them, by far the vast majority of copies of the original text.*” See his remarks under *Early Conspirators and Corrupters.*

‘Our critic’ resorted to the same subterfuge as White did for rejecting the Received Text<sup>8 p 134-5</sup>. “*The usual ingenious but completely unproved response is that the exemplars of the Byzantine text were worn out from constant use.*”

Dr Hills’s explanation still applies.

“*Hills gives a more detailed explanation:*

“*Burgon regarded the good state of preservation of B and Aleph in spite of their exceptional age as a proof not of their goodness but of their badness. If they had been good manuscripts, they would have been read to pieces long ago. “We suspect that these two manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, SOLELY TO THEIR ASCERTAINED EVIL CHARACTER; which has occasioned that the one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in A.D. 1844) got deposited in the wastepaper basket of the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai. Had B and Aleph been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable*



*fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight.”*

*“Thus the fact that B and Aleph are so old is a point against them, not something in their favour. It shows that the Church rejected them and did not read them. Otherwise they would have worn out and disappeared through much reading. Burgon has been accused of sophistry in arguing this way, but certainly his suggestion cannot be rejected by naturalistic critics as impossible. For one of their “own poets” (Kirsopp Lake) favoured the idea that the scribes “usually destroyed their exemplars when they had copied the sacred books.”*

*“If Lake could believe this, why may not orthodox Christians believe that many ancient Byzantine manuscripts have been worn out with much copying and reading? And conversely, why may we not believe that B, Aleph and the other ancient non-Byzantine manuscripts have survived unto the present day simply because they were rejected by the Church and not used?”*”

See Burgon’s comments earlier and note again what he also states in the context<sup>10</sup>.

*“I am utterly unable to believe, in short, that God’s promise has so entirely failed, that at the end of 1800 years much of the text of the Gospel had in point of fact to be picked up by a German critic out of a waste-paper basket in the convent of St. Catherine; and that the entire text had to be remodelled after the pattern set by a couple of copies which had remained in neglect during fifteen centuries, and had probably owed their survival to that neglect; whilst **hundreds of others had been thumbed to pieces, and had bequeathed their witness to copies made from them.**”* This author’s emphasis.

White<sup>3 p 44-5</sup> then tries to dispose of the corruptions in the Alexandrian text as follows.

*“Another common claim made by those who defend the KJV is that the Alexandrian texts have been corrupted by “heretics.” They point to men like Origen who did things and believed things that most modern fundamentalists would find more than slightly unusual, and on this basis make the very long leap to the assertion that the manuscripts that come from the same area must be “corrupt.” The problem is that you can also find excellent examples of orthodox Christians in the same area just as you can find some rather heretical folks in the Byzantine area, too.”*

White has notes<sup>3 p 50-1</sup> on the above to the effect that, *“It might be difficult for them to find anyone in the ancient church, even around Antioch and Byzantium, who would look a whole lot like a modern fundamentalist Baptist. Even the most conservative of the ancient Fathers, like John Chrysostom, would provide KJV Only advocates with numerous reasons to object to his theology, beliefs, and practices. Alexandria gave us Athanasius, the great defender of the deity of Christ, while the area around Antioch and Byzantium was infested with Arians, those who denied it. Is this sufficient basis for rejecting the Byzantine text-type a priori? Of course not.”*

White gives no indication about how the Arians allegedly infesting Antioch influenced the *Text* of scripture. His comments are therefore irrelevant. The *scriptural* distinctions between Antioch and Alexandria have been addressed elsewhere<sup>8 p 10-11</sup>.

See also remarks about Origen and the Alexandrian school under **White’s Introduction** and **Early Conspirators and Corrupters**. And note that both Paul and John warned and strove against bible-corrupting heretics.

**“For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ”** 2 Corinthians 2:17.

Note again Wilkinson's remarks about John, from *Early Conspirators and Corrupters*.

*"While John lived, heresy could make no serious headway. He had hardly passed away, however, before perverse teachers infested the Christian Church...These years were times which saw the New Testament books corrupted in abundance."*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 206-211</sup> answers White as follows.

*"[White] lied again: the disease is incurable. Nobody "asserted" anything. Aleph and B are corrupt and it has been proved "beyond the shadow of doubt" to anyone but a blind, prejudiced, treacherous liar. They have been proved to be corrupt on the basis of internal evidence, apart from the location of any "area." The man who spent five years collating them (in the Gospels) said they were depraved\*. White calls five years of detailed examination by a "true scholar" (his term for Dean Burgon\*\*) a "vilifying." He is a liar. He was born that way and he will never get over it.*

*"It was the same area that Origen worked in, and that area was corrupt before Origen got there and after he left. God said that if any Jew tried to translate an "LXX" in Egypt (Jer. 44:26) HE WOULDN'T EVEN HONOUR HIS OWN NAME WHEN THE JEW RECORDED IT..."*

\*Dr Waite cites Burgon as follows<sup>10</sup>.

\*\*See White<sup>3 p 91</sup>.

*"Codexes B/Aleph/C/D are the several depositaries of a fabricated and depraved text:...[and] are probably indebted for their very preservation solely to the fact that they were anciently recognized as untrustworthy documents. Do men indeed find it impossible to realize the notion that there must have existed such things as refuse copies in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries as well as in the eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh? And that the Codexes which we call B/Aleph/C/D may possibly, if not as I hold probably, have been of that class?"*

Dr Ruckman then cites thirteen separate pieces of evidence documenting Origen as a heretic, e.g.

*"Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, complains about corruptions (2 Cor. 2:17) between AD 175-250. That is where Origen was working on manuscripts in Alexandria and Caesarea..."*

*"It is Clement of Alexandria who confirms Eusebius. Scrivener says "The worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected originated within one hundred years after it was composed." This is the time that P75 and P66 were written."*

See comments under **White's Introduction**. Dr Ruckman continues.

*"A source of corruption (2 Cor. 2:17) is found in Low-Latin manuscripts and especially in Africa. (Alexandria is in Africa)...It turns out to be Origen corrupting Old Latin manuscripts in ALEXANDRIA and corrupting Syrian manuscripts in Caesarea. Six pages of documented evidence by the Dean follow this material [The Traditional Text, p 144-5]. White never mentioned it.*

*"[Citing Burgon, The Traditional Text, p 22ff]"Another source of corruption is fixed at ALEXANDRIA."*

*"Syria and Egypt – Egypt, Asia, and Africa seem to meet in Palestine (Caesarea) under ORIGEN."*

*"Griesbach...conceived ORIGEN to be THE standard for the ALEXANDRIAN TEXT."*

*“Origen says **“behind me”**\* should be omitted from Luke 4:8...because “to be behind Jesus is a good thing” [Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p 168-9]. Note! The omissions in Aleph and B are connected with an Alexandrian who believed in making omissions in the earliest texts on the basis of his own theological idiosyncrasies, instead of manuscript evidence.*

*““The sceptical character of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts affords a strong proof of the alliance between them and the Origenistic school. Origenistic doctrines came from the blending of philosophy (Col. 2:8) with Christianity in the schools of Alexandria” [Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p 171].*

*“And Bible believers “leap to the assertion,” do they Jimmy? We have trouble with the “FACTS,” do we Jimmy, when dealing with Alexandria, Origen, Vaticanus, NIV, Sinaiticus, and the NASV? Hey stupid! Don’t sleep on your side at night: what little you have left in your skull is liable to run out your ears.”*

*\*The statement **“and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan”** is omitted by the 1582 JR, DR, RV, NIV, NRSV, NWT, JB<sup>8 p 69</sup>, even though it has overwhelming manuscript support<sup>9 p 87-8</sup>, which in this instance cannot be dismissed by White as “harmonization” because although it is found in Matthew 16:23 and Mark 8:33, the expression only occurs once in the scriptures, in Luke 4:8, where the Lord is addressing Satan directly. See also **Appendix, Table A5**.*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 525ff</sup> states.*

*“Scholars identify Clement and Origen of Alexandria, Egypt as two of the “grievous wolves” of Paul’s warning (Acts 20:29, 30). The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics follows the tracks of the wolf pack down to the twentieth century: “Clement and Origen, by which...Platonism...was incorporated into Christianity...Modern thinkers, for example Westcott, are in sympathy with Clement and Origen.”*

*“The chart at the end of this chapter\* reveals Clement and Origen, not as high points, but as low points reaching down into the New Age pit for their doctrine. The History of Heresy calls Origen a ‘Christian Gnostic’ who was pronounced a ‘heretic’ by a series [of] general synods.”*

*\*Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes this chapter of *New Age Versions* with a compilation of statements from Origen and other false teachers; Plato, Philo, Clement, compared with equivalent statements from new versions and New Age doctrine, including Monism (Unitarianism), the Lord Jesus Christ as a created being, New Age spiritual hierarchy – declaring the Lord Jesus Christ to be “a son of the gods” or “a god,” NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT – and the progressive elevation of fallen man to God by means of an inner “divine principle,” contrary to scripture, because Paul said **“in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing”** Romans 7:18. Dr Mrs Riplinger continues.*

*“The philosophical school, based in Alexandria, had seen as its head Pantaenus, a pagan Gnostic, followed by Clement, who was succeeded by Origen. Like Philo, these scholars attempted to cross the young Christian cub with the wailing wolf of the ‘hidden wisdom’ of paganism. Philip Lee, author of *Against the Protestant Gnostics* and graduate of Princeton and Harvard Divinity Schools observes: “The Alexandrian school was indeed one of the historical moments in the church’s closest proximity to Gnostic heresy...[For] Clement and Origen...gnosis [hidden wisdom], far from being a forbidden word, was a basic tent of their system...”*

*“The encyclopaedia Man, Myth and Magic lists Ammonius Saccas of Alexandria as the founder of Madame Blavatsky’s Luciferian Theosophy and the foundation of the New Age philosophy. Westcott seems to share Blavatsky’s ardour for Saccas when writing: “His success shewed that he had some neglected forms of **truth** [source’s emphasis] to make known; and Origen became one of his hearers...There can be no doubt that Origen was deeply influenced by the new philosophy.”*

*“Blavatsky summonses Origen dozens of times in her Isis Unveiled to pander [to] her occult doctrines. Her Theosophical Glossary places him where he belongs, as a “disciple” of neo-Platonism at the Alexandria School of Ammonius Saccas. She sees Clement and Origen as apologists for her occult world view: “It is maintained on purely historical grounds that Origen...and even Clement had themselves been initiated into the Mysteries, before adding to the Neo-Platonism of the Alexandrian school that of the Gnostics, under a Christian veil.”*

*“She calls it ‘a Christian veil’; Jesus called it ‘wolves’ clothing’. Blavatsky is not alone among New Agers in seeing Clement and Origen as ‘fellow-travellers’...New Age books, like The Hidden Wisdom in the Holy Bible, quote Origen at length with such blasphemies as, “The Laws of men appear more excellent and reasonable than the laws of God.” Rudolf Steiner’s The Esoteric basis of Christianity, a book teeming with positive references to Lucifer, says: “The divinity of man, of all men, was taught...from the writings of Origen and Clement. Plato is saturated with it.”*

*“The McClintock and Strong Encyclopaedia records Origen as saying, “The scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.” Hidden Wisdom vaults Origen’s allegorical method of bible interpretation saying: “Disciples of Saccas and the neo-Platonists of Alexandria and their successors [Clement and Origen] down to this present day have all regarded world scripture as being largely, but not entirely allegorical.””*

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists Origen’s heretical beliefs and summarises scholars’ findings on how Origen’s beliefs influenced the corruption of the Alexandrian manuscripts Aleph and B.

*“The church declared Origen a heretic because he held the following beliefs:*

- 1. The Logos [the Lord Jesus Christ] is subordinate to the Father and has some characteristics similar to the Logos of the Gnostics.*
- 2. The soul is pre-existent: Jesus took on some pre-existent human soul.*
- 3. There was no physical resurrection of Christ nor will there be a second coming. Man will not have a physical resurrection.*
- 4. Hell is nonexistent; purgatory, of which Paul and Peter must partake, does exist.*
- 5. All, including the devil, will be reconciled to God.*
- 6. The sun, moon and stars are living creatures.*
- 7. Emasculation, of which [Origen] partook, is called for males.*

*“The beliefs of the Alexandrian school, particularly those of Origen, are of critical interest to us because scores of scholars, tracing the history of the transmission of the text of the bible, see the hand of the Alexandrian scribes in the corruption of certain ancient copies of the text...”*

*“Dr Phillip Comfort, author of Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament states: “The early manuscripts exhibit some very significant differences in the wording of the New Testament, text differences pertaining to the titles of the Lord Jesus Christ, Christian doctrine and church practice as well as significant word variations...Textual corruption happened at such an early date...Origen was the first New Testament critic.”*

*“Dr David Fuller, Princeton scholar finds: “Many of the important variations in the modern versions may be traced to the influence of Eusebius and Origen.”*

*“Dr Edward F. Hills, Harvard and Yale scholar, relays: “Origen...was not content to abide by the text which he received but freely engaged in the boldest sort of conjectural emendations. And there were other critics at Alexandria...who deleted many readings in the original New Testament and thus produced the abbreviated text found in the papyri and in the manuscripts Aleph and B...”*

*“World [renowned] scholar Herman Hoskier feels: “We do not necessarily recover Origen’s manuscripts when we are inclined to follow Aleph and B, but very likely only Origen himself.”*

*“John Burgon, author of scores of scholarly books on the transmission and corruption of the original Greek manuscripts...said [Causes of Textual Corruption, p 95, The Revision Revised, p 336]: “I am of the opinion that such depravations of the text [as found in Aleph and B] were in the first instance intentional. Origen may be regarded as the prime offender...the author of all the mischief...The archetype of Codices B and Aleph...is discovered to have experienced adulteration largely from the same pestilential source which must have corrupted the copies with which clement (and his pupil Origen after him) were most familiar. – And...I behold in these last days a resolute attempt made to revive and to palm off upon an unlearned generation the old exploded errors, under the pretence that they are the inspired Verity itself, - providentially recovered from a neglected shelf in the Vatican, - rescued from destruction by a chance visitor to Mount Sinai.”*

Burgon’s comments were aimed at Westcott and Hort’s RV but they constitute an accurate assessment of James White’s entire thesis. As Burgon<sup>13 p xxvi</sup> states succinctly of the Westcott-Hort approach in the Preface to *The Revision Revised*, “It dispenses with proof. It furnishes no evidence. It asserts when it ought to argue. It reiterates when it is called on to explain...“I am sir Oracle.””

Again, a wholly accurate summing up of White’s whole book.

Cloud<sup>6 Part 3</sup> states.

**“WHITE DOWNPLAYS THE THEOLOGICAL APOSTASY OF ORIGEN.**

*“White says, “Another common claim made by those who defend the KJV is that the Alexandrian texts have been corrupted by ‘heretics.’ They point to men like Origen (A.D. 185-254) who did things and believed things that most modern fundamentalists would find more than slightly unusual, and on this basis make the very long leap to the assertion that the manuscripts that come from the same area must be ‘corrupt’” (White, p. 44).*

*“Note that the word “heretics” is in quotation marks. In other words, White would have his readers believe that it is only the “King James Only” crowd that identifies Origen and his followers as heretics, that this is another example of the alleged ignorance of the fundamental Baptists who make up a large percentage of King James Bible defenders today. In a footnote connected with the previous statement, White goes even further to cast aspersions upon those who would identify Origen as a heretic:*

*“Indeed, it might be difficult for them to find anyone in the ancient church, even around Antioch and Byzantium, who would look a whole lot like a modern fundamentalist Baptist. Even the most conservative of the ancient Fathers, like John Chrysostom, would provide KJV Only advocates with numerous reasons to object to his theology, beliefs, and practices” (White, pp. 50,51, footnote 24).*

*“Fundamental Baptists do not look to men such as Chrysostom as “fathers.” We don’t have “fathers,” for the Lord Jesus Christ forbade us to call men fathers (Matt. 23:9). We don’t need some second century “church father” who was himself influenced by the apostasy of his day and about whom we have only a very incomplete record. We have the Lord Jesus Christ and the Apostles. We have the infallible Scriptures which have been preserved unto us. We have the faith once delivered to the saints. In the second and third centuries the apostasy was already taking form which would lead in the fourth and fifth centuries to the formation of the Roman Catholic Church. The leaven of heresy was permeating through many of the churches, and many of those who are called “fathers” by Protestants and Catholics were heretics. Further, we don’t use a meaningless term like “the ancient church.” What church does White mean by that term? In the early centuries there were churches which were apostate and which were rejecting the apostolic faith, and there were churches which were not and which were standing fast in the apostolic faith. What church does he mean? The man needs to read some good Baptist histories like that of John Christian and Thomas Armitage to get his ecclesiology and church history straightened out. The fact is that many of the “fathers” of the church, so called, were persecuting the Bible-believing churches of that day. Augustine is an example of this.*

*“Further, the evidence that Origen himself was a heretic of the highest order is overwhelming, and it does not come from the pens of fundamental Baptists. Origen paved the way for Arianism by teaching that the Logos was subordinate and inferior to the Father, that there was a difference of essence between the Father and the Son. He believed in the “deity” of Christ, but not as it is defined biblically. This is precisely the heresy which was raising its ugly Unitarian head and influencing Biblical scholarship and textual research in the last half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. What a coincidence!*

*“Origen is described by Mosheim (in his Com. de Rebus Christ, Vol. II, p. 144) as ‘a compound of contraries, wise and unwise, acute and stupid, judicious and injudicious; the enemy of superstition, and its patron; a strenuous defender of Christianity, and its corrupter; energetic and irresolute; one to whom the Bible owes much, and from whom it has suffered much.’ While he gained, amidst the superstitious contemporaries who then gave character to Eastern Christianity, a splendid reputation for sanctity, as well as learning, his character was evidently dishonest and tricky, and his judgment most erratic. ... As a controversialist, he was wholly unscrupulous” (Discussions of Robert Lewis Dabney, I, p. 383).*

*“Origen taught baptismal regeneration and “evidently had no clear conception of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith” (Berkhof, The History of Christian Doctrines, p. 65). This is an important fact, because it means that the gospel Origen taught was a false gospel, and he therefore was under God’s curse (Galatians 1). Origen believed in purgatory and claimed that all men would eventually be reclaimed through the purgation of sin after death. This is a denial of the sufficiency of Christ’s atonement to wash away all sin of the believer. He taught that even the demons and Satan would eventually be restored (Berkhof, p. 75). Origen taught the pre-existence of man. He believed the Holy Spirit was the first creature made by the Father through the Son. Origen “disbelieved the full*

*inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, holding that the inspired men apprehended and stated many things obscurely” (Discussions of Robert Lewis Dabney, I, p. 383). Origen’s “opinions on the Trinity veered between Sabellianism and Arianism. He expressly denied the consubstantial unity of the Persons and the proper incarnation of the God-head” (Dabney, I, p. 384).*

*“Origen championed the method of Bible interpretation known as allegorizing, by which the literal meaning of Scripture is rejected for a “deeper meaning” discovered by the interpreter. Such a method makes the mind of the teacher authoritative over the plain meaning of Scripture; because if the plain sense of Scripture is not the true meaning, it is impossible to determine exactly what it does mean, and every man is therefore left to his own devices. Origen’s voluminous commentaries contain a wealth of fanciful interpretations, abounding “in references to apocryphal works and heretical revisals of Scripture” (Frederick Nolan, Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, 1815, p. 367). “His reputation as the great introducer of mysticism, allegory, and Neo-Platonism into the Christian church, is too well known to need recital. THOSE WHO ARE BEST ACQUAINTED WITH THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN OPINION KNOW BEST, THAT ORIGEN WAS THE GREAT CORRUPTER, AND THE SOURCE, OR AT LEAST EARLIEST CHANNEL, OF NEARLY ALL THE SPECULATIVE ERRORS WHICH PLAGUED THE CHURCH IN AFTER AGES” (Dabney, I, p. 383).*

*“I don’t believe James White should have put the word “heretic” in quotation marks when referring to Origen! Earlier we noted Origen’s destructive influence upon many Bible editors and translators who came after him\*. For White to imply that Origen was not an apostate and that his influence was not as harmful as King James Bible defenders argue, is indefensible.”*

\*See Cloud’s remarks earlier under **Early Conspirators and Corrupters** and the extensive discussion of “*the textual corruptions introduced by Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea and other heretical editors during the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries*” in Part 1 of his review.

Yet, White has this further intended endorsement<sup>3 p 45</sup> of Codex Aleph – where he effectively shoots himself in the foot, as the saying goes.

*“It is important to emphasise that the differences between the Alexandrian and Byzantine text-types do not result in two different New Testaments. A person who would read Codex Sinaiticus and who would apply sound exegetical methods to its text would come to the very same conclusions as anyone reading a Byzantine manuscript a thousand years later.”*

As Dean Burgon did<sup>13 p 16</sup>. See his conclusions earlier about the old codices, summarised as follows.

*“We venture to assure [the reader], without a particle of hesitation, that Aleph B D are three of the **most scandalously corrupt copies extant**: - exhibit **the most shamefully mutilated texts** which are anywhere to be met with...the **depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of the Truth**, - which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God.”* This author’s emphasis.

And as Dr Mrs Riplinger did, about *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Epistle of Barnabas*. See comments earlier and note that Dr Hills<sup>8 p 109-110</sup> listed 10 heretical readings in Codex Aleph, where he concluded as follows.

*“Here we have (ten) readings which either deny the deity of Christ or in some way detract from it. All (ten) of them are found in Aleph. All (ten) of them are supported by other ancient New Testament documents. (Six) of them occur in Papyrus 75...The longer we ponder the evidence of these important passages, the more obvious it becomes that the texts of Papyrus 75 and of Aleph were the work of heretics who for some reason were reluctant to acknowledge Jesus to be the Son of God. And the same seems to be true of B and the other manuscripts of the Alexandrian type. Long ago Burgon and Miller pointed out this heretical trait in Aleph and B, and their observations have never been refuted.”*

Certainly not by James White.

It is a pity that he did not apply “*exegetical methods*” as sound as those of Burgon, Dr Hills and Dr Mrs Riplinger. But does White now put forward “*sound exegetical methods*” as “*the highest standard of truth*” instead of, or in addition to, “*the message of the Scriptures*” and “*the whole tenor of Scripture teaching*” etc.? See **Introduction** and the set of 10 questions posed earlier. If so, he does not say.

White<sup>3 p 45-6</sup> then lists 23 passages of scripture where the modern Greek texts such as Nestle’s and the modern versions translated from them remove or shorten names and titles pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ found in the Received Text and the AV1611; Matthew 4:18, 12:25, Mark 2:15, 10:52, Luke 24:36, Acts 15:11, 16:31, 19:4, 10, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 9:1, 16:22, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 5:18, 11:31, 1 Thessalonians 3:11, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 12, Hebrews 3:1, 1 John 1:7, 2 John 3, Revelation 1:9, 12:17.

He insists that, “*KJV Only advocates take [this list] as evidence of an effort on the part of the Alexandrian text to denigrate the person of Christ. Yet, this is logically untenable. The full title of the “Lord Jesus Christ” occurs 86 times in the KJV; it is found 64 times in the New Testament of the NASB, and 61 times in the NIV. If the modern translations were trying to “hide” anything, why not exclude these other readings?*”

The simple answer to that question is that the Devil is not as stupid as James White. Note that of the 241 passages of scripture where White mostly compared the AV1611 unfavourably with modern versions, the DR, JR agree with the AV1611 in 54% of the passages but the NIV in only 4% of the passages, while the NIV joins with the JB, NWT in departing from the AV1611 in 70% of the passages and with the DR, JR, JB or NWT in 89% of the passages. The drift away from AV1611 readings is by no means abrupt but gradual, though nevertheless steady, according to the motto of Bishop Autun SJ, “*Surtout, pas trop de zele,*” (above all, not too much zeal)<sup>59 p 231</sup>.

How many references to the Lord Jesus Christ will ‘The Final Bible’<sup>14 p 555ff</sup>, contain and will any of them refer to Him as the Second Person of the Godhead? See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks earlier about *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Epistle of Barnabus*.

Then, compare Psalm 91:10-12 with Luke 4:10a-11.

***“For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.”***

***“He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee: And in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.”***

Allowing for the omission of “*For*” in Luke 4:10, the extra “*And*” and the addition of “*at any time*” in Luke 4:11, the Devil cites no fewer than 27 of the 32 words in the ‘original,’ or 84%, well in excess of the apparent 71-74% retention of the title “*The Lord Jesus Christ*” to which White refers for the NIV and NASV.



Given that the Devil is prepared to cite over 80% of a passage pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ, it is realistic to conclude that a 70+% citation, such as found in the NASV, NIV, is a Devil's 'bible.'

But of the passages that White lists, agreement with or departure from the AV1611 is as follows. See *Appendix, Table A1*.

*Agreement:*

Matthew 4:18, 12:25, Mark 10:52, Luke 24:36, NIV, Mark 2:15, 1 Thessalonians 3:11, JB

*Departure*

Mark 2:15, 1 Thessalonians 3:11, NIV, NWT, Mark 10:52, Luke 24:36, JB, NWT, Acts 15:11, 16:31, 19:4, 10, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 9:1, 16:22, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 5:18, 11:31, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 12, Hebrews 3:1, 1 John 1:7, 2 John 3, Revelation 1:9, 12:17, NIV, JB, NWT.

The NIV agrees with the AV1611 in 4 of the 23 verses, or 17%. It departs from the AV1611 with the JB, NWT in 17 of the verses, or 74% and with the NWT in 19 verses or 83%.

Once again, in the guise of "sir oracle," White<sup>3 p 46</sup> resorts to the farcical explanation "expansion of piety" to resolve the discrepancies and in so doing infers that God gave His words to Rome and Watchtower but not to faithful bible believers such as the Waldenses<sup>8 p 17</sup>, "who kept Thy truth so pure of old" until that Truth found its ultimate expression, as the words of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible. Some of the verses that White lists will be addressed when they are encountered later in his book<sup>3 p 195</sup>.

See also the comments above with respect to White's "harmonisation" theory of the AV1611 readings for Ephesians 1:2 and Colossians 1:2, by Dr Ruckman, Dr Mrs Riplinger, Charles Hadden Spurgeon, Dr Holland and David Daniels, where Daniels concludes, appropriately for all these writers, "Modern Bibles take away many places where God says the same thing again. Thus modern Bibles make it look like those doctrines weren't so important to God."

Cloud states<sup>6 Part 3</sup> further.

**"WHITE MAKES AN ISSUE THAT DOCTRINES ARE NOT ENTIRELY REMOVED FROM THE MODERN VERSIONS.**

*"To my knowledge, no one is saying that doctrines are entirely removed from the modern versions. The typical argument is that key doctrines are weakened and diluted, not entirely removed, yet James White repeatedly makes an issue of the fact that the various doctrines are not removed. For example, of the doctrine of the virgin birth he says:*

*"Matthew 1:25 is often cited by critics of modern translations as an attempt to deny the virgin birth of Christ. Yet if a modern translation wished to do this, why not remove the parallel occurrence of the term at Luke 2:7 where all the modern translations contain the disputed term?" (White, p. 159).*

*"Modern version defenders like James White appear not to understand the importance and power of repetition and of details, yet this is obviously the reason why the Bible is filled with the same. When the Lord wanted to impress Pharaoh with coming events, he repeated the dream two times (Gen. 41:32). When the Lord wanted to impress Peter that the Gospel was for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews, he repeated the vision three times (Acts 10:16). The Lord Jesus Christ often emphasized His statements with the double*

phrase, "Verily, verily." In the book of Ezekiel the phrase "they shall know that I am the Lord" is repeated 106 times. The Bible is literally filled with this type of repetition. Does that mean the repetitious details are not important? Hardly! Yet that is precisely what the modern version defenders tell us. For example, in Mark 9, the Received Text and the King James Bible repeat "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" three times (verses 44, 46, 48). In the United Bible Societies Greek text and in the modern English versions, this statement is omitted from two of those places. It is in verse 48 but verses 44 and 46 are removed. Is this of no consequence? I believe a sermon in which the unspeakably horrible eternal nature of hell is mentioned three times is more potent than one in which it is mentioned only once. Another example of this is in Matt. 4:4 and Luke 4:4. In the KJV both verses contain the crucial statement that man lives "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The Greek Received Text has both statements. The critical Greek text, though, and the modern versions which follow that text, omit this statement from Luke 4:4. Not important, says White. It is in Matthew 4:4, and that is enough. Nonsense, says the King James Bible defender, it should be in both places because repetition and detail in God's Word are crucial! That is one of the most important statements in the entire Bible, and it makes sense that the Holy Spirit would repeat it.

"King James Bible defenders have made this point many times, but James White has ignored it. Why would the devil (assuming the textual differences were demonic corruptions) remove a verse in one place and leave a similar one in another? Why would he not go ahead and remove an entire doctrine? James White asks this question at various points in his book and seems to think that it is unanswerable, but I find that the answer is rather obvious. It would be almost impossible to entirely remove a doctrine from the Scriptures, but it was not so difficult to weaken certain key doctrines by a whittling down process through textual corruptions introduced by demonically-controlled men (such as Origen) and to dilute the potency of the Scripture overall through this same process. In warfare, a repeating rifle is much more effective than a single shot one! To take the thousands of omissions in the modern texts and translations as lightly as James White does is strange in light of the biblical warnings such as: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you" (Deut. 4:2).

"We conclude this section with an excellent statement on the importance of omissions in the Bible:

"Getting back to the omissions again, some defend them by pointing out that while a text might be missing from one place in Scripture, it is sometimes found somewhere else in Scripture. In other words, in some cases, essential writings were not removed from all passages. 'So,' they exclaim, 'what is all of this fuss about?' Beyond question, this has to be one of the most reckless attitudes toward Scripture in the Church, and can only belong to those so dulled by compromise and backslidden in heart that they have lost all sense of reality. The Bible is not simply another publication out there on the open market of religious books. It is the very word of God, which God deliberately placed above His own name (Ps. 138:2), and of which even He Himself, will not alter one word (Ps. 89:34). How then can a God fearing Christian justify even the slightest omission from its page? Are they not as much as saying that men have as much right to discard Scriptures as God did to write them down?

"To justify an omission because it can be found somewhere else does not answer the question of why it was removed in the first place. Instead, such a slight of hand explana-

tion openly insults the declared infallibility of God's Holy Word, creates alibis for its corrupters, and instructs the saints that they can live without all of God's counsel. It plainly lowers the Bible in status to just 'another book' that we can do with as we please.

““However, while the Church's tolerance for blemished Scripture is high - God's is not. If He forbids, under the severest penalty, the adding or taking away of a single word of Scripture in Rev. 22:18,19, will He be lenient with those who support translations that have clearly tampered with the Scriptures? Or, will they stand as guilty on the day of judgment for their rationalizing, as the ones who did the tampering in the first place?

““Satan does not have to do much from without when such indifference lies within. It is this very spirit of non-resistance that the spoilers of God's Word had hoped for and that will encourage them to do even further damage to Scripture. With the unchangeable Word of God now subject to the changeable views of men, what will the next generation of Bibles be like? If we today are willing to give up our most for less, will saints of tomorrow be willing to give up this less for nothing? Surely, paganism lies at the door.” (Chick Salliby, *If the Foundations Be Destroyed*, Fiskdale, MA: Word and Prayer Ministries, 1994, pp. 88, 89).”

Concerning the omissions of the Lord's names and titles that White attempts to justify, Fowler<sup>60 p 42ff</sup> notes 173 references where the NIV omits names of our Lord God. Chick Salliby notes many of these omissions and writes<sup>61 p 66-7</sup> with respect to these alterations (author's emphasis).

“There are at least 378 additional references to Jesus (by title) in the NIV that cannot be found in the KJV...however, the following should also be mentioned:

1. Of these 378 additional titles, NOT ONE OF THEM can be found in the Traditional Text from which the KJV was translated. A text, incidentally, that agrees with about ninety percent of the ancient manuscripts that have been passed down to the present time.
2. Only a few of these additional titles (roughly one out of every twenty) can even be found in the corrupted texts from which the NIV was translated. Even the oldest of the modern English versions, the Revised Version of 1881, that can generally be found in agreement with the NIV, only recorded 19 of these 378 additional titles. So, we can see that the vast majority of them were plainly invented by the NIV's translating committee.
3. Although it is proper to italicise any additional words not found in the original text, none of these 378 extra titles were italicised, or flagged in any other manner, to show that they did not appear in the source documents.
4. Lastly, the vast majority of these extra titles serve no purpose. For the most part, each one replaced a pronoun that just as clearly referred to Jesus, or was plugged into text that did not need the support of the additional title to inform the reader that it was dealing with Jesus.

“All of the above should cause one to question why, in view of this overrun of nonessential unauthorized titles, were so many authorized titles of Jesus removed from the NIV, where it was necessary for the reader to have them. God knew where He wanted the name of Jesus in the Bible, as He did every other word, jot, or title. Therefore, whether His choices agree with our current ideas or not, or can be defended on grounds for which we find any sufficient reasoning at all, it is the duty of all translators of GOD'S WORD to

*provide for the reader GOD's WORD. Or else they should entitle their book by some other name."*

White<sup>3 p 47-8</sup> concludes this chapter with some speculative comments on the preservation of the scriptures.

*"KJV Only advocates are quick to assert that those who do not join them in making the KJV the final authority in all things do not believe in the "preservation of the Scriptures." Almost all KJV Only books will contain a section on how God has promised to preserve His words, and they will, of course, assume that these "words" are found in the KJV...fighting for a belief that all Christians would naturally defend: the idea that God has revealed himself, and has done so in such a way that we can continue to know that revelation perfectly today.*

*"The problem with the position taken by the defender of the AV is that he has not demonstrated that his way is the only way to understand the idea of "preservation." Does God have to preserve His Word in the way KJV Only advocates believe? Or might God have done this in another way...a much less flashy way?..."*

*"By having the text of the New Testament "explode" across the known world\*, ending up in the far-flung corners of the Roman Empire in a relatively short period of time, God protected that text from the one thing that we could never detect: the wholesale change of doctrine or theology by one particular man or group who had full control over that text at any one point in its history...there was never a time when any one man, or any group of men, could gather up all the manuscripts and make extensive changes in the text itself, such as cutting out the deity of Christ, or inserting some foreign doctrine or concept. No one could gather up the texts and try to make them all say the same thing by "harmonizing" them, either...Indeed, by the time anyone did obtain great ecclesiastical power in the name of Christianity, texts like P66 or P75 were already long buried in the sands of Egypt, out of reach of anyone who would try to alter them. The fact that their text is nearly identical to even the most "Byzantine" manuscript of 1,000 years later is testimony to the overall purity of the New Testament text."*

\*An explosion of the New Testament text seems distinctly "flashy" to this author but James White is a master of obfuscation.

White has again confused "texts" with "manuscripts." The papyri are in fact manuscripts that are notoriously corrupt and are not identical to "Byzantine" manuscripts. If they were identical to "Byzantine" manuscripts, God would have had no reason to bury them in the sands of Egypt because the "Byzantine" or Received Text was quite obviously well preserved without them. The papyri are useful insofar as they *do* constitute an early witness to the Received Text<sup>8 p 129ff</sup>, as much as 40-50% and overall a stronger witness to it than to the Alexandrian text but 40-50% agreement with the Received Text is far from "nearly identical" to the vast majority of "Byzantine" manuscripts and these fragments were discarded precisely because they were *poor* manuscripts<sup>14 p 581-2</sup>.

Remember too that Moorman<sup>9 p 16-17</sup> has found that the papyri as a whole support the Received Text, AV1611, against the Alexandrian text, NIV, in 39 passages versus 182 of his 356 doctrinal passages, where the papyri are extant. Again, this is hardly "nearly identical." See remarks under ***God's Book – the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.***

However, White insists, without evidence, that *"The side effect of this method of preserving the New Testament is the relatively small amount of textual variation...Dr Kurt Aland has pointed out what he calls the tenacity of the New Testament text. This refers to the fact that once a variant reading appears in a manuscript, it simply doesn't go away. It*

*gets copied and ends up in other manuscripts...And that means that we still have the original readings of the New Testament works. You see, if readings could just “disappear” without a trace, we would have to face the fact that the original reading may have “fallen through the cracks” as well. But the tenacity of the New Testament text, while forcing us to deal with textual variants, also provides us with the assurance that our work is not in vain. One of those variant readings is the original. We are called to invest our energies in discovering which one it is.”*

Called by whom, and according to which commands in scripture? White, as usual, leaves the reader guessing.

Wilkinson’s overview of church and textual history utterly refutes White’s idle speculations, together with Aland’s. See *White’s Introduction* and note this comment from Wilkinson.

[Citing historian Stanley] *“And so well did God’s true people through the ages agree on what was Scripture and what was not, that that no general council of the church, until that of Trent (1545) dominated by the Jesuits, dared to say anything as to what books should comprise the Bible or what texts were or were not spurious.”*

In the light of Wilkinson’s thoroughgoing research, White’s remarks above about “textual variants” are absurd. He is also wrong in asserting that no changes were made to the Traditional, or Received Text “such as cutting out the deity of Christ, or inserting some foreign doctrine or concept.”

The reader should recall Dr Ruckman’s remarks on Matthew 19:16, 17, Mark 1:2, Luke 2:33, John 1:18, 3:13 – the *only* New Testament reference on Christ’s omnipresence – above, with respect to weakening, i.e. *gradually* cutting out the Deity of Christ and Dr Ruckman’s citation of Dr Hills<sup>1 p 111, 113</sup>.

*““It is NOT true that there are no various readings which involve cardinal Christian doctrines. On the contrary, in the handful of dissenting manuscripts there are a HOST of corrupt readings which ALL bring into question such doctrines as the essential GOD-HEAD of CHRIST.””*

As for “foreign concepts,” note from Dr Ruckman’s analysis how the Lord Jesus Christ is made into a sinner by omission of “**without a cause**” from Matthew 5:22, how the bringing in of God’s literal, physical kingdom on earth is obscured by omission of the ending from Matthew 6:13, how the false notion that all angels are God’s, when some are “**evil**” Psalm 78:49, is conveyed by omission of “**of God**” from Matthew 22:30, how the omission of “**for them that trust in riches**” from Mark 10:24 allows the sinner to still trust in riches and enter the kingdom of God and how redemption is equated to remission by omission of “**through his blood**” from Colossians 1:14.

Moorman<sup>9</sup> shows that Codices B and the other old codices are the sources for these alterations, especially Aleph (except for that of Matthew 22:30). Contrary to White’s assertion above, these important readings *did* “disappear” without a trace” from manuscripts such a B and Aleph that White<sup>3 p 33</sup> regards as “great.”

Moreover, what about the “foreign concepts” introduced by the apocryphal New Testament books such as *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Epistle of Barnabas*, found in Codex Aleph? See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s findings above.

See also *Early Conspirators and Corrupters* for the heretical beliefs of the Romanizing portion of the Church of England that Wilkinson described with respect to “**philosophy and vain deceit**,” Colossians 2:8, “**science falsely so called**,” 1 Timothy 6:20, “**profane**

*and vain babblings*” 2 Timothy 2:16-18 and, as Dr Mrs Riplinger warns, the notion espoused by J. H. Newman, that “*the unseen universe was inhabited by hosts of intermediate beings who were spiritual agents between God and creation,*” derived from deletion of “*only begotten*” from John 1:14, 18, 3:16, 18, 1 John 4:9.

As Wilkinson warned, citing Harnack.

*“The greatest enemies of the infant Christian church, therefore, were [found]...in the rising flood of heresy which, under the name of Christianity, engulfed the truth for many years. This is what brought on the Dark Ages. This rising flood...had multiplied in abundance copies of the Scriptures with bewildering changes in verses and passages within one hundred years after the death of John (100 A.D.).”*

Salliby<sup>61</sup> p 11ff also notes how the NIV alters or omits portions of the following additional passages, directly or indirectly to weaken the doctrine of the Deity of Christ; Matthew 8:2, 9:18, 24:36, Mark 1:31, 3:15, 6:33, 51, Luke 1:28, 2:43, 49, 8:43, 9:7, John 1:27, 5:4, 6:11, 69, 9:4, 35, Acts 2:30, 3:13, 26, 7:37, 15:18, Romans 14:10, Ephesians 3:9, 14, 5:30, Philippians 2:6, 1 Timothy 3:16, Hebrews 10:30, 1 Peter 3:15, 1 John 4:3, 5:7, 8, Jude 25, Revelation 1:8, 9, 11, 13, 14:5, 20:12.

Berry<sup>62</sup> shows that for most of the 41 verses that Salliby cites, the textual changes\* that the NIV follows to downgrade the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ come from the critical editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, who essentially followed the Alexandrian text<sup>8</sup> p 149-152. (The NIV omission of “*which had spent all her money on physicians*” in Luke 8:43 is from Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition.)

\*Matthew 8:2, 9:18, Luke 2:49, Acts 3:13, 26, Philippians 2:6 involve changes of translation that weaken the testimony to the Lord’s Deity, i.e. alteration of “*worshipped*” to “*knelt*,” Matthew 8:2, 9:18, “*my Father’s business*” to “*my Father’s house*,” Luke 2:49, “*Son*” to “*servant*,” Acts 3:13, 26, “*thought it not robbery to be equal with God*” to “*did not consider equality with God something to be grasped*,” Philippians 2:6.

The above comparisons show that White is lying again. Moreover, Grady, citing Pickering<sup>8</sup> p 116 has disproved White’s notion that “*once a variant reading appears in a manuscript, it simply doesn’t go away.*”

*““The “oldest is best” advocate will often resort to the analogy of a flowing stream. This line of reasoning assumes...that the closer one gets to the stream’s source, the purer the water MUST be...Pickering throws in the proverbial monkey wrench:*

*““This is normally true, no doubt, but what if a sewer pipe empties into the stream a few yards below the spring? Then the process is reversed - as the polluted water is exposed to the purifying action of the sun and ground, THE FARTHER IT RUNS THE PURER IT BECOMES (unless it passes more pipes). That is what happened to the stream of the New Testament transmission. Very near to the source, by 100 A.D. at least, THE POLLUTION STARTED GUSHING INTO THE PURE STREAM.”*”

The “*textual variants*” – and deletions – that White eulogises did *not* proliferate like the Received Text did. They were confined largely to the early copies that were corrupted by heretics like Origen and located mostly in known centres of heresy, i.e. Rome, Alexandria, Caesarea and a Catholic monastery near Egypt in the case of Aleph. See remarks above by Dr Ruckman, Dr Mrs Riplinger and David Cloud on Origen and remarks earlier on *Early Conspirators and Corrupters*.

Dr Ruckman<sup>1</sup> p 16, 215-217 answers White as follows.

*“[White] is about to state...that maybe God chose a “less spectacular” way to preserve the “originals.” The less spectacular way...was to preserve His words in a corrupt Greek manuscript secreted in the Roman Catholic Vatican, and another corrupt Greek manuscript hidden in a wastebasket; both remained hidden until Hort revived them (1880) as the Reformation ended...*

*“Here is the Scholarship only advocate “double-speak” in full bloom. “Fighting for a belief that all Christians would naturally defend: the idea that God has revealed himself, and has done so in such a way that we can continue to know that revelation perfectly.” There is the Alexandrian in the raw, again. How did God reveal Himself? He didn’t say. What did he mean when he said “in such a way?” Well, what was it? And the capstone: “continue to know that revelation.” What revelation? No answer. Absolute silence...*

*“There is no reference in White’s statement to God’s Book, God’s word, God’s words, the word of God, or God’s revelation of himself in a BOOK. The word “BIBLE” means “BOOK.” It does not mean “original autographs,” it does NOT mean “word variants,” it does not mean “original manuscripts,” and it does not mean “text types.” No “Bible” was mentioned. What you read was the official, doctrinal, theological statement of neo-orthodoxy as given by Barth and Brunner. You see, Jimmy pretended that he had the original “readings” in his hands. He did this while telling you the King James “readings,” quoted before A.D. 330 were not valid. What he is telling you now is that he and his book-selling buddies have a perfect revelation of God (see above) and you don’t...*

*“The “perfect revelation” (see above) is two corrupt Greek texts which the Body of Christ (not an elite group of Nicolaitans) dumped 1,650 years ago.”*

Dr Ruckman then points out that to fulfil White’s self-appointed task of devoting “our energies in discovering which [variant reading] is [the original],” a Christian would have “to spend a minimum of four years in post-graduate work.”

White’s assertion here is like our critic’s, who insisted<sup>8 p 104</sup>, without evidence, that “[Every] version must be subject to the original languages,” meaning in effect that the AV1611 can be altered at will, according to the demands of linguistic ‘scholarship,’ or in White’s case<sup>3 p 95</sup>, “individual responsibility.”

White and our critic appear to have been led by the same unholy spirit.

Dr Ruckman adds in a note to his above comments<sup>1 p 442-3</sup>, “This is the ACME of hypocrisy. White is implying that if you have the education HE has you can determine which words are in the original and which ones aren’t. Hence he brags about his “well trained mind” (p. 248)\*. He attributes sloppy preaching and shallow interpretation of the Bible to ignorance of Greek and Hebrew. The sloppiest, craziest, most ineffectual, muddle-minded, fouled-up interpretation and boring preaching in this century is from the characters who correct the AV with Hebrew and Greek (A. T. Robertson, Kenneth Wuest, Robert Dick Wilson, Philip Schaff, Rosenthal, Ryrie, Pickering, Zane Hodges, Farstad, Kutilek, etc.)

*“Peter, James, John, Paul, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and JESUS CHRIST never gave White’s advice to any Christian on the face of this earth, living or dead.”*

\*White states<sup>3 p 247-8</sup> that “English-speaking people today have access to the best [unspecified] translations that have ever existed, and by diligent comparison of these [unspecified] translations any English-speaking person can study and know God’s Word [unspecified between two covers – White still has no “bible”]...There is no inconsistency between Christian piety and a well-trained mind. There should be a desire on the part of

*many believers to be as prepared as they can be to be students of God's [unspecified] Word. Our local Bible colleges should have many applicants seeking a place in a beginning Greek or Hebrew class...God is not honoured by sloppy preaching and shallow interpretation of the [unspecified] Bible."*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 218</sup> continues.

*"In reference to that "perfect revelation," [White] is telling you that you can find it if you have the EDUCATION he has...The surest proof that he is lying like a dog is the fact that neither he, nor anyone he knows, nor anyone he ever heard of (including any group or individual), in 100 years of revising the King James Bible, has ever produced a "PERFECT REVELATION" of God which we can "continue to know." Two hundred attempts\* have been made in one hundred years; one attempt every six months...*

*"And WE can continue to know that revelation perfectly today"? Who is "WE," you Fakir? The reference is not to any man, woman or child reading this sheet of paper. White's "WE" is a reference to less than 0.0009 percent of the Body of Christ, and that 0.0009 percent has NEVER YET PRODUCED A "PERFECT REVELATION" OF ANYTHING. They "continued" in nothing but speculation.*

*"[White] lied "slap through" from start to finish."*

\*See work by Vance<sup>63 p 106ff</sup>.

The words of the NIV Preface, *"the work of translation is never wholly finished"* entirely vindicate Dr Ruckman's conclusions.

In answer to White's notions of *"less spectacular"* preservation, Cloud<sup>6 Part 1</sup> states further:

*"King James Bible defenders argue that it is impossible to believe in biblical preservation and to accept the tenets of modern textual criticism. The latter claims that the purest text of Scripture was misplaced or unused for centuries and did not begin to be recovered until the end of the 19th century. Textual critics tell us that the Received Text, which was without question the traditional text of the vast majority of Bible-believing Christians from 1500 to 1900, is an impure text that contains thousands of latter additions. They tell us that the pure text of the New Testament is actually the shortened Westcott-Hort type text represented today in the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament. The problem is that this text was rejected for hundreds of years until textual critics such as Tischendorf exalted it in the late 1800s, while the Received Text was greatly honored by God. If the Received Text is indeed the impure text, the promise of God has failed. God preserves His Word in its use among His people, not in its misuse and neglect.*

*"Consider a statement that illustrates the way the Received Text-King James Bible defender looks at Bible preservation. This statement was made in 1970 by Donald Brake in a Master of Theology thesis entitled "The Doctrine of the Preservation of Scriptures" presented to the faculty of the Department of Systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary:*

*"The issue ultimately is: Has God preserved throughout history a continuous, uninterrupted text for the Church or has He merely preserved for one thousand years a corrupted text and then revealed His true text when a German critic at the convent of St. Catherine picked out of a wastebasket one single manuscript?" (Donald Brake, reprinted from Counterfeit or Genuine? Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, p. 179)."*



A most perceptive question that White is unable to answer.

In the notes of this chapter, White makes the assumption<sup>3 p 50</sup> that John 5:4 “*ended up in most Greek manuscripts, including the ones from which the KJV was translated...someone included a note in their manuscript explaining the tradition behind the sick and the pool. This manuscript was copied and the explanatory note inserted into the text itself.*”

The manuscript evidence for and against John 5:3b, 4 has been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 73-4</sup>, where it is noted that the AV1611 has early attestation in Old Latin Text, the Old Syriac Peshitta, Tertullian 220 AD and 200 copies of Tatian’s Diatessaron of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, AD 175. Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that<sup>39 p 729</sup> the passage is found in the Anglo-Saxon Bibles pre-dating the year 700 AD. Why were the Anglo-Saxon bible believers misguided, if their scriptures were in error? White’s knowledge of biblical history is so inferior to Gail Riplinger’s that he cannot even pose the question, let alone answer it.

See also Moorman<sup>9 p 102</sup>, who draws attention to the immediate context, what White overlooked, “*Verse 7 pre-supposes a miraculous moving of the water.*” Moorman confirms Tertullian’s and Tatian’s early citings.

So contrary to White’s assertion, the verses are found in texts that pre-date P66, P75, the earliest witnesses that omit the passage.

White forgets that where a note that is *not* scripture is inserted into a manuscript, it is *not* perpetuated, as illustrated by Grady’s citation of Pickering – see above. Moreover, Burgon<sup>8 p 67, 64, p 81-2</sup> has specifically discussed one such spurious insertion, namely the so-called “*short conclusion*” to Mark’s Gospel, found in Codex L, according to Burgon, “*a solitary MS of the 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> century which exhibits and exceedingly vicious text,*” which White also overlooked.

Burgon states, “[Codex L] is described as the work of an ignorant foreign copyist, who probably wrote with several MSS before him, but who is found to be wholly incompetent to determine which reading to adopt and which to reject. Certain it is that, he interrupts himself, at the end of [Mark 16] verse 8, to write as follows:

““*Something to this effect is also met with: “All that was commanded them they immediately rehearsed unto Peter and the rest. And after things, from East even unto West, did Jesus Himself send forth by their means the holy and incorruptible message of eternal Salvation.” “But this also is met with after the words, ‘For they were afraid’: “Now, when he was risen early, the first day of the week...”*”

“*It cannot be needful that I should delay the reader with any remarks on such a termination of the Gospel as the foregoing. It was evidently the production of someone who desired to remedy the conspicuous incompleteness of his own copy of St. Mark’s Gospel, but who had imbibed so little of the spirit of the evangelical narrative that he could not in the least imitate the Evangelist’s manner.*”

“*As for the scribe who executed Codex L, he was evidently incapable of distinguishing the grossest fabrication from the genuine text.*”

An observation that is reminiscent of James White, who repeatedly fails to recognise genuine portions of scripture with overwhelming attestation. Yet the Lord Jesus Christ promised that “*the Spirit of truth...will guide you into all truth*” John 16:13.

Which ‘spirit’ is guiding James White?

Dr Hills<sup>65</sup> p 145-6 notes that “[John 5:3b, 4]...has been defended not only by conservatives such as Hengstenberg (1861) but also by radicals such as A. Hilgenfeld (1875) and R. Steck (1893). Hengstenberg contends that “the words are necessarily required by the connection,” quoting with approval the remark of von Hofmann...that it is highly improbable “that the narrator, who has stated the site of the pool and the number of the porches, should be so sparing of his words precisely with regard to that which it is necessary to know in order to understand the occurrence, and should leave the character of the pool and its healing virtue to be guessed from the complaint of the sick man, which presupposes a knowledge of it.” Hilgenfeld and Steck rightly insist that the account of the descent of the angel into the pool in verse 4 is presupposed in the reply which the impotent man makes to Jesus in verse 7...

“The fact that Tatian (c. 175) included this reading in his Diatessaron also strengthens the evidence for its genuineness by attesting its authenticity.”

The Trinitarian Bible Society<sup>66</sup> states that, “The copy quoted by Tertullian was certainly written more than a hundred years earlier than Codex Vaticanus...and possibly even before either of the two papyrus fragments which omit the words. The evidence shows that very early in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century there were in existence some copies which included and some which omitted these words. The evidence also makes it quite clear that in the following centuries the majority of copies and versions over a wide area retained the disputed words as an authentic part of the inspired text.”

White does not, indeed cannot, explain why “the majority of copies and versions over a wide area retained the disputed words” and why the minority of copies that omitted them remained lost and forgotten for centuries, especially throughout the period of Reformation and Revival.

Job once asked, “**Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the LORD hath wrought this?**” Job 12:9.

James White, for one.

More examples will follow but examination of the passages of scripture addressed in this chapter provides clear refutation of the fifth and sixth of White’s postulates.

- The modern translations do *not* yield superior readings to the AV1611.
- The *do* attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

#### **Chapter 4 – “Putting It Together”**

White<sup>3 p 53-4</sup> makes a further attempt to undermine belief in 1611 Authorised Holy Bible by reference to the approach of Erasmus, first editor of the Received New Testament Text, to “*many of the same textual variants that are discussed today by modern scholars*” and to “*the printed editions of the KJV [that] differ from one another, presenting more difficulties for the most radical proponents of the infallibility of a human translation.*”

Note first that despite White’s insistence<sup>3 p vi-vii</sup> that his book “*is not against the King James Version,*” he has shifted from calling it “*a great, yet imperfect translation*” to merely “*a human translation.*” He is being ‘inconsistent.’

White first makes an allegation about<sup>3 p 54-5</sup> to Erasmus’s “*paucity of manuscripts*” and apparently marvels that “*Erasmus...was able to produce such a fine text with so few resources.*” This allegation leads White<sup>3 p 69</sup> to a patently false conclusion under the heading of *The Text Of The Reformation?*

*“Everyone admits that the Greek text utilized by Luther in his preaching, and Calvin in his writing and teaching, was what would become known as the TR. But we must point out that they used this text by default, not by choice. In other words, it was not a matter of their rejecting other “text types” such as the manuscripts of the Alexandrian family, so much as it was a matter of using what was available.”*

White is wrong about both Erasmus’s resources and the sole availability of the TR during the time of the Reformation. Cloud<sup>6 Part 3</sup> states.

**“WHITE MAKES AN ISSUE OF ERASMUS, OF HIS PERSONAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND TEXTUAL WEAKNESSES, PRETENDING THAT THE WEAKNESSES OF ERASMUS DETRACT FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT.**

*“This topic has been dealt with frequently by defenders of the Authorized Version. Frederick Nolan (1784-1864), in his 576-page *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament* (available in reprint from Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108), defended the sixteenth-century text on the basis of faith and theological purity, and he opposed the critics of his day who were disparaging the work of Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza in a manner mimicked by today’s modern version proponents. Nolan, in a careful and very technical manner, traced the history of the doctrinal corruptions which were introduced into the text of various manuscripts during the first four centuries after Christ. **Nolan devastates the popular idea that Erasmus and the Reformation editors were working with insufficient textual evidence and that they did not know about the readings preferred by today’s textual critics.**”* This author’s emphasis. Cloud continues.

**“NOLAN SHOWS THAT THE REFORMATION EDITORS DID NOT FOLLOW THE RECEIVED TEXT BECAUSE THEY LACKED SUFFICIENT TEXTUAL EVIDENCE, BUT BECAUSE THEY CONSCIOUSLY CHOSE TO REJECT THE CRITICAL READINGS. (Contrast this with White’s statement on page 69 that the Reformation editors “used this text by default, not by choice.”) Consider the following statement from Nolan’s book:**

**““WITH RESPECT TO MANUSCRIPTS, IT IS INDISPUTABLE THAT HE [ERASMUS] WAS ACQUAINTED WITH EVERY VARIETY WHICH IS KNOWN TO US; HAVING DISTRIBUTED THEM INTO TWO PRINCIPAL CLASSES, one of which corresponds with the Complutensian edition [i.e. Received Text], the other with the Vatican manuscript. And he has specified the positive grounds on which he received the one and re-**

jected the other. The former was in the possession of the Greek church, the latter in that of the Latin; judging from the internal evidence he had as good reason to conclude the Eastern church had not corrupted their received text as he had grounds to suspect the Rhodians from whom the Western church derived their manuscripts, had accommodated them to the Latin Vulgate. One short insinuation which he has thrown out, sufficiently proves that HIS OBJECTIONS TO THESE MANUSCRIPTS LAY MORE DEEP; and they do immortal credit to his sagacity. In the age in which the Vulgate was formed, the church, he was aware, was infested with Origenists and Arians\*; an affinity between any manuscript and that version, consequently conveyed some suspicion that its text was corrupted” (Nolan, *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, pp. 413-15).”

\*They must have emigrated from Antioch. Good riddance ☺ ! See the discussion in the previous chapter of White’s denial<sup>3 p 50-1</sup> of manuscript corruption by heretics. Cloud continues.

“The fact is that at least many of the Reformation leaders believed that God had preserved His Word in a certain family of manuscripts which can be called the Traditional or Received Text and it was to this text that these wise men looked when they were searching for the words of God. It was not a decision they made out of ignorance or happenstance. The Reformation editors recognized that the Traditional Text is \*theologically pure whereas the text represented by Vaticanus and friends is impure. In a word, they did not adopt the Received Text out of ignorance, but out of conviction!”

\*The term “theologically pure,” is understood to mean free from doctrinal error, weakening or omission. This is true of the Received Text but not the Alexandrian. See the previous chapter for Dr Ruckman’s summary, with accompanying scriptures, of doctrines weakened, omitted or altered by changes from the AV1611 Text introduced into the modern versions by the Alexandrian text. See also the discussion on Origen’s heresies, which influenced the Alexandrian text with respect to weakening the doctrine of the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 932ff</sup> writes extensively of Erasmus, the sources that he used to compile his Greek New Testament and the predominance of this Text from apostolic to Reformation times. See also Wilkinson’s remarks on “Fundamentally, there are only two streams of bibles” under **Early Conspirators and Corrupters**. Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that, her emphasis.

“[Erasmus] wrote that he has acquired so **many** manuscripts that he needed two assistants to help carry them and plenty of time to “arrange them”...

“Kenneth W. Clark, the scholar who has examined more Greek manuscripts than most, admits, “We should not attribute to Erasmus the creation of a ‘received text,’ but only the transmission from a manuscript text, already commonly received, to a printed form, in which this text would continue to prevail for three centuries”...

“Today there are over 5200 manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. KJV critics ignore the fact that over 99% agree with Erasmus’ Greek New Testament and the KJV. Less than one percent [44 corrupt ones]...agree with the old omissions and changes in the NIV, NASB, NRSV...The agreement of this tiny minority is far from unanimous on many changes.

“Yet other critics, such as James White<sup>3 p 58-9</sup>, feel that, “Erasmus guessed” or “Erasmus’ hunch” led him to the readings which match almost every Greek manuscript known to-day... Without the preservation of the text by God, try guessing all of them for yourself...”

*“James White feigns<sup>3 p 62</sup>, “Three men were primarily responsible for the creation of the Greek text utilized by the KJV translators in their work on the New Testament: Desiderius Erasmus, Robert Etienne, better known as Stephanus, and Theodore Beza.” White...is trying to give his readers the false impression that these men ‘created’ this text, rather than merely PRINTING the Greek text that was received everywhere. Erasmus’ Greek New Testament text was a mirror of the handwritten Greek texts which were used before the advent of the printing press. Erasmus was merely the first to PRINT IT, PUBLISH IT AND CIRCULATE IT, in the new printed format...” (author’s emphasis).*

*“Critics often assert that ‘Erasmus did not have the manuscripts we have today.’ In fact, he had access to every reading currently extant, and rejected those matching the Catholic Vulgate, NIV, NASB today...”*

*“Erasmus reveals clearly in the Preface (p. xviii) to his Greek New Testament, that he knew of the readings of the corrupt Greek text type. He attributed corruption to Origen!”*

Note White’s criticism<sup>3 p 44-5</sup> of bible believers cited in the previous chapter. *“Another common claim made by those who defend the KJV is that the Alexandrian texts have been corrupted by “heretics.” They point to men like Origen who did things and believed things that most modern fundamentalists would find more than slightly unusual, and on this basis make the very long leap to the assertion that the manuscripts that come from the same area must be “corrupt.””*

According to White, Erasmus must have made such an assertive “long leap,” yet White insists<sup>3 p 53</sup> that *“Erasmus was on “our side”[i.e. anti-bible believers] in this...[KJV Only] controversy”* because *“Many of the exact same arguments that are used today by KJV Only advocates were used against Erasmus nearly 500 years ago!”*

White does not inform his readers that Erasmus evidently ‘changed sides’ with respect to the fundamental matter of Alexandrian corruptions that distinguish this text from the Received Text. Once again, White is being ‘inconsistent.’

White also insists that *“The very man to whom AV defenders must defer for the vast majority of their New Testament text used the very same argument and methodology to defend his work that modern textual scholars use to defend the readings of the NASB or NIV!”*

White does not care to explain the obvious question prompted by his remark. *How did Erasmus therefore arrive at a different text?* Once again, despite his lengthy discussion<sup>3 p 57-60</sup> on Erasmus’s notes, he leaves the reader guessing.

Moreover, AV bible believers do *not* defer to Erasmus but as Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly indicates, *“the preservation of the text by God.”*

Her researches on Erasmus clearly refute White’s assertions about Erasmus, as does Cloud’s citation of Nolan, above. Dr Mrs Riplinger also cites Nolan, as follows.

*“Frederick Nolan, writing in 1815, states, “Erasmus published an edition, which corresponds with the text which has since been discovered to prevail in the great body of Greek manuscripts”” (author’s emphasis).*

Note that White’s opinions about arguments used against Erasmus and that Erasmus *“used the very same argument and methodology to defend his work that modern textual scholars use to defend the readings of the NASB or NIV”* do not bear close scrutiny.

For example, White<sup>3 p 56</sup> states that *“We are often told that God has blessed the KJV more than any translation of the [unspecified] Bible, and the fact that it was the “only” Bible*

for hundreds of years should be grounds enough for us today to hold it as the standard. We have already noted how attached many conservative theologians were to the “traditional” text of the Latin Vulgate in the days of Erasmus.”

Dr Hills’s<sup>65 p 196-7</sup> comment is useful in response, his emphases.

“The *scholastic* theologians, on the other hand, warmly defended the Latin Vulgate as the only true New Testament text. In 1514 Martin Dorp of the University of Louvain wrote to Erasmus asking him not to publish his forthcoming Greek New Testament. Dorp argued that if the Vulgate contained falsifications of the original Scriptures and errors, the Church would have been wrong for many centuries, which was impossible. The references of most Church Councils to the Vulgate, Dorp insisted, proved that the Church considered this Latin version to be the official Bible and not the Greek New Testament, which, he maintained, had been corrupted by the heretical Greek Church. And after Erasmus’ Greek New Testament had been published in 1516, Stunica, a noted Spanish scholar, accused it of being an open condemnation of the Latin Vulgate, the version of the Church. And about the same time Peter Sutor, once of the Sorbonne and later a Carthusian monk, declared that “If in one point the Vulgate were in error, the entire authority of holy Scripture would collapse.”

“Believing Bible students today are often accused of taking the same extreme position in regard to the King James Version that Peter Sutor took more than 450 years ago in regard to the Latin Vulgate. But this is false. We take the third position which we have mentioned, namely, the **common** view. In Erasmus’ day this view occupied the middle ground between the humanistic view and the scholastic view. Those that held this view acknowledged that the Scriptures had been providentially preserved down through the ages. They did not, however, agree with the scholastic theologians in tying this providential preservation to the Latin Vulgate. On the contrary...they asserted the superiority of the Greek New Testament text.”

Moreover, Dr Vance<sup>63</sup> has shown that the AV1611 was *not* “the “only” Bible for hundreds of years.” Hundreds of other versions came into existence before and after the AV1611 was published, including the Jesuit Douay-Rheims and Challoner’s Revision, together with the Revised Version of 1881 and the American Standard Version of 1901. God ignored them all.

The “*conservative theologians*” who held to the Vulgate were actual or allied to *Catholics*, whose Church savagely persecuted the true bible believers such as the Waldenses<sup>8 p 16-17</sup>, who held steadfastly to the Received Text, “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21. See also Wilkinson’s remarks, under *Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare*, showing that bibles of the Received Text type actually *pre-dated* Jerome’s Vulgate.

White’s attempt to equate faithful AV1611 bible believers and their spiritual ancestors who suffered under “*the iron heel of the papacy*” during the Dark Ages with “*conservative theologians*” belonging to or subservient to the same persecuting church is therefore grotesque.

White<sup>3 p 56-7</sup> cites correspondence between Erasmus and Dorp, a supporter of the Vulgate, where Dorp states “*If...the Latin translator varies in point of truth from the Greek manuscript, at that point I bid the Greeks goodbye and cleave to the Latins.*” White asks plaintively, “*How does this differ in the least from the words of a modern KJV Only advocate, Dr Samuel Gipp, “Question: What should I do where my Bible and my Greek Lexicon contradict? Answer: Throw out the Lexicon”? Or this statement by the same writer, “Question: What about a contradiction that can’t be successfully explained? Answer:*

*You will have to accept the perfection of the Authorized Version by faith.” Erasmus dismissed such arguments out of hand. “What will you do with the errors of copyists?” Erasmus asked Dorp.”*

White’s questions beg a further question, is he now referring to Lexicons as “*the highest standard of truth*”? Less than a quarter of the way through White’s book several possible candidates have emerged for this exalted office.

- White own opinion<sup>3 p 26</sup>. See discussion in the previous chapter of White’s opinion that the NIV’s rendering of “*“flesh” in Paul’s epistles as “sinful nature” [is] a bit too interpretive for my tastes.*”
- “*The whole tenor of Scripture teaching.*” See White’s citation<sup>3 p 39-40</sup> of Phillip Schaff’s comments on “*textual variants.*”
- “*The message of the scriptures.*” See White’s citation of Schaff.
- “*Sound exegetical methods.*” See White’s evaluation of the ‘great treasures,’ Aleph and B.

Other candidates may yet emerge ☺ !

But for now, it should be understood that the exchange between Erasmus and Dorp about the Latin Vulgate and the Greek manuscripts bears no relation to the questions that Dr Gipp answers.

Hodges<sup>8 p 115</sup> notes that “*the more than 8000 Vulgate manuscripts which are extant today exhibit the greatest amount of cross contamination of textual types. But an unguided process achieving relative stability and uniformity in the diversified textual, historical, and cultural circumstances in which the New Testament was copied [i.e. for the Majority Text], imposes impossible strains on our imagination.*

*“Herein lies the greatest weakness of contemporary textual criticism. Denying to the Majority text any claim to represent the actual form of the original text, it is nevertheless unable to explain its rise, its comparative uniformity, and its dominance in any satisfactory manner. All these factors can be rationally accounted for, however, if the Majority text represents simply the continuous transmission of the original text from the very first. All minority text forms are, on this view, merely divergent offshoots of the broad stream of transmission whose source is the autographs themselves...”*

And Dr Mrs Riplinger adds<sup>39 p 945, 947</sup>, “*The liberal Encyclopedia Britannica of 1910 had to admit of Erasmus’s Greek text, “It revealed the fact that the Vulgate [whose readings can be seen today in the new versions]...was not only a second-hand document, but in places an erroneous document”...Robert Stephanus...produced a printed Greek New Testament after the death of Erasmus. He used the 16 Greek manuscripts in the library of King Francis I and his son Henry II. He said that they were all identical down to the letter! He used, “**identical** ancient quality codices in the possession” of the King’s library” (author’s emphasis).*

A vast difference exists between the Vulgate, with its extensive “*cross contamination of textual types*” and the relative uniformity of manuscripts underlying the Received Text and the AV1611. Erasmus was therefore correct in warning of “*the errors of copyists*” in the Vulgate versus the comparative purity of his transmitted Greek Text. And Dr Gipp was sound in urging belief in the AV1611 for the same reasons.

Moreover, White seems not to have noticed that as a compilation by men, a Lexicon is not the Holy Bible, AV1611 and, despising Dr Mrs Riplinger as he does, White has ignored her findings<sup>14 p 601</sup> on the dubious nature of modern Lexicons.

*“The Greek and Hebrew Lexicons are written by men, “most of whom are unbelievers,” writes Princeton and Yale scholar Edward Hills. A few examples will suffice: 1) The New Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon’s editor (Briggs) was defrocked by the ‘liberal’ Presbyterian Church for his ‘liberalism.’ 2) Trench, author of the much used Synonyms of the New Testament, was a member of Westcott’s esoteric clubs, as was Alford, whose Greek reference works are still used. 3) J. Henry Thayer, author of the New Thayer’s Greek Lexicon, was a Unitarian who vehemently denied the deity of Christ. (Thayer was also the dominant member of the ASV committee!) His Lexicon contains a seldom noticed warning by the publishers in its Introduction (p. vii). It cautions readers to watch for adulterations in the work relating to the deity of Christ and the Trinity. 4) The acclaimed A. T. Robertson’s Greek Grammar also sends up a red flag in its preface saying, “The text of Westcott and Hort is followed in all its essentials.” 5) Conclusions drawn by Kurt and Barbara Aland of the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament elicit the response by Phillip Comfort that “the Aland’s designations must be taken with caution.” Hills summarises:*

*““Undeniably these unbelievers know a great many facts by virtue of God’s common grace. They misrepresent these facts, however because they ignore and deny God’s revelation of Himself in and through the facts.”*

*“These and other lexicons abstract Kittel’s expanded dictionary, which defines words based on citations by ancient Greeks like Plato, Socrates, Aristotle and other pagan sources. When applied to bible words, these pagan interpretations serve, not as a magnifying glass, as most suppose, but as a glass darkened by the shadow of fallen men...”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 591ff</sup> reveals that German theologian, Gerhard Kittel, editor of the celebrated 10-volume *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, joined the Nazi Party in 1933 and began work on his dictionary in the same year. He remained a staunch supporter of Hitler throughout the Nazi era, was vehemently anti-Jewish and was tried, convicted and imprisoned after WW2 *“for his key part in the extermination of two thirds of Europe’s Jewish population.”* Kittel’s anti-Semitism led him to deny the final authority of the scriptures and to apply the *“spiritually bankrupt grammatico-historico method of exegesis used by today’s lexicons”* – see above – instead of the method **“which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual,”** 1 Corinthians 2:13b, i.e. comparing scripture with scripture. Dr Mrs Riplinger continues.

*“We have all heard bible teachers, following a Kittel-like Lexicon cite phileo and agapao, as the two Greek words which are translated ‘love’ in the New Testament. Phileo, according to their grammatico-historico method of exegesis, would mean ‘to be a friend’; agapao would mean ‘an unselfish God-like love.’ These definitions, garnered from the secular Greek writers of the time, do not represent God’s use of the terms.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>67 p 48-9</sup> shows elsewhere by means of scripture with scripture comparison of Romans 10:16, 17, 2 Corinthians 4:2, 3 and 2 Timothy 2:8, 9 that the AV1611’s built-in dictionary gives the correct meaning of the term **“gospel”** as **“the word of God.”** She states that *“Most new versions, like the NIV, NRSV...and reference works like Vine’s Complete Expository Dictionary or Zodhaites Complete Word Study Dictionary, opt for the incorrect rendering “good news” and notes that “The standard dictionary used by*



*new version translators and creators of new lexicons is The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, by Gerhard Kittel.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 602-3</sup> alludes to Dr Gipp’s study<sup>68 p 124ff, 162-3</sup> of several verses, John 5:20, 16:27, 1 Corinthians 16:22, Ephesians 5:25, 28, Colossians 3:18, Titus 2:4, 3:4, 1 John 3:10, 4:10, revealing the error of the “*grammatico-historico method of exegesis*” for the words *phileo* and *agapao* (Readers may observe this error in the Lexicons for themselves by checking the occurrences of *phileo* versus *agapao* in the above verses.)

She also states that Dr Gipp is a “*former seminary professor,*” a detail that White neglected to mention but which does add scholarly weight to Dr Gipp’s evaluation of the usefulness, or otherwise, of Greek aids to bible study.

Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes that “*Comparing “spiritual things with spiritual things” by studying all of the citations of ‘love’ in a complete concordance...gives God’s definition of the word within the context of all the verses. ‘Love’, for example, is defined in 1 John as “keep his commandments.” We are to ‘act’ in love, not to ‘feel’ love. Going along with the New Age, new versions [NASV] render Mark 10:21, “felt a love for” rather than “Jesus loved him.”*”

White also neglected to give the complete context of Dr Gipp’s answers, although he later accuses<sup>3 p 97</sup> Dr Mrs Riplinger of “*a plethora of out-of-context citations and edited quotations, frequently misrepresenting the positions of the authors [New Age Versions] attacks.*”

This is precisely what James White does concerning Dr Gipp. White has a ‘double standard’ in this respect, in addition to being ‘inconsistent’ again.

Concerning the Lexicon question, Dr Gipp<sup>68 p 148</sup> states “*Oftentimes a critic of God’s Bible will point to a Lexicon or Greek grammar book for authority in an effort to prove that a word has been mistranslated in the Bible. This is rather foolhardy, and flies in the face of their purported claim to accept the Bible as their final authority in all matters of faith and practice... (Author’s emphasis)*

“*On the weight of our acceptance of the Bible as our “final authority in all matters of faith and practice” we must accept its renderings of the Greek as more accurate and authoritative than the opinion of the fallible human authors of our Greek study guides.*” (Author’s emphasis.)

On the matter of an unresolved contradiction<sup>68 p 156-7</sup>, Dr Gipp states, again with his emphasis, “*NO ONE can have ALL of the answers. There are two reasons for this. First, if I or any other defender of the Authorized Version had ALL of the answers, we would be GOD...Second, and most importantly, if we could get ALL of our questions answered then concerning the Bible issue, we would be walking by sight not by faith (Hebrews 11:6, 2 Corinthians 5:7)...*

“*A resort to “faith” as our final and “last ditch” defense is not as inconsistent or precarious as it first might seem.*

“*Not inconsistent, because, as previously stated, God would rather we have faith in Him in the faith of the unexplainable, as so many of the Old and New Testaments saints have exhibited, than to have faith in our own human ability to “find an answer” concerning difficult passages.*

*“It is certainly not precarious in that it **does not** leave us at the mercy of our vindictive opponents. For believing in the perfection of a Book which **we can hold in our hands** is surely not as vulnerable as a **professed faith** in the perfection of some **lost originals**...*

*“We are willing...to take abuse from our “self conceited brethren” and give answers for our reasonable faith in a **tangible** Book rather than in an **idealistic** original. We need not apologize.”*

Dr Gipp’s “highest standard of truth” (White’s term<sup>3 p vii</sup>) is both consistent and understandable. White’s is neither.

And Dr Holland<sup>4</sup> notes a further example of White’s inconsistency and double standard.

*““Anyone who believes the TR to be infallible must believe that Erasmus, and the other men who later edited the same text in their own editions (Stephanus and Beza), were somehow 'inspired,' or at the very least 'providentially guided' in their work. Yet, none of these men ever claimed such inspiration. (p. 58)*

*“First of all, who believes these men were inspired by God in the same sense the Old and New Testament writers were inspired? White assumes the KJV advocate believes this, and then expresses that men like Erasmus “never claimed to be inspired.” Secondly, White quotes Dr. Edwin Palmer of the NIV translation committee as saying, “John 1:18, as inspired by the Holy Spirit...declare(s) that Jesus is God” (p. 103). Because the KJV has a different rendering here, Dr. Palmer calls the KJV and its Greek texts “inferior” and his Greek text “inspired”. If a KJV advocate had used such wording concerning the TR, White would have objected.”*

White here<sup>3 p 60</sup> uses Erasmus’s comments to level the first of numerous charges against bible believers of inconsistency. See comments under **White’s Introduction**.

*“The words of Erasmus himself are seen to refute many of the arguments used by modern defenders of KJV Onlyism. If KJV Only advocates were to be consistent, they would have to reject Erasmus’ work, which is the basis for the KJV, on the very same grounds as the modern translations. Anyone engaging in textual criticism is said to be “judging God’s Word,” yet Erasmus did the very same thing! Of course, they do not reject Erasmus’ work, thereby demonstrating their system to be inconsistent and self-contradictory. I can say with confidence that if Desiderius Erasmus were alive today he would not be an advocate of the AV 1611. He would, instead, reject vociferously the very same arguments he faced so long ago, and in so doing would have to reject the very foundation of the King James Only position.”*

Dr Holland has this comment on White’s speculation.

*“A few favorite instances of White's straw man are where he tries to convince the reader that if men like Hills or Erasmus or even the KJV translators themselves were alive today, they would agree with White. This is speaking for the dead.*

*““I can say with confidence that if Desiderius Erasmus were alive today he would not be an advocate of the AV 1611” (p. 60). How does White know this? Has he been speaking with Erasmus lately?”*

Note also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments above, reproduced again here.

*“Erasmus’ Greek New Testament text was a mirror of the handwritten Greek texts which were used before the advent of the printing press. Erasmus was merely the first to **PRINT IT, PUBLISH IT AND CIRCULATE IT**, in the new printed format...” (author’s emphasis).*

*“Critics often assert that ‘Erasmus did not have the manuscripts we have today.’ In fact, he had access to every reading currently extant, and rejected those matching the Catholic Vulgate, NIV, NASB today...”*

Bible believers are not being *“inconsistent and self-contradictory”* because *“they do not reject Erasmus’ work.”* Whatever reservations Erasmus harboured about individual texts of scripture, he nevertheless produced a Greek New Testament that is essentially that of the AV1611. Bible believers therefore rightly condemn the modern translations because they have adopted the Catholic texts that Erasmus *rejected*. White cites the late Dr Edward F. Hills with respect to variations in the Received Text<sup>3 p 68</sup> but not in the following instance with respect to Erasmus<sup>65 p 199</sup>.

*“If Erasmus was cautious in his notes, much more was he so in his text, for this is what would strike the reader’s eye immediately. Hence in the editing of his Greek New Testament text especially Erasmus was guided by the common faith in the current text [see Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks above]. And back of this common faith was the controlling providence of God. For this reason Erasmus’ humanistic tendencies do not appear in the Textus Receptus which he produced. Although not himself an outstanding man of faith, in his editorial labours on this text he was providentially influenced and guided by the faith of others. In spite of his humanistic tendencies Erasmus was clearly used of God to place the Greek New Testament text in print, just as Martin Luther was used of God to bring in the Protestant Reformation...”*

Nevertheless, White casts doubt on numerous AV1611 readings, including several in the Book of Revelation, where in White’s opinion, Erasmus’s *“paucity of manuscripts”* resulted in *“some mistakes that found their way into the printed editions of Erasmus’ Greek text, and finally into the text of the King James Version.”*

White<sup>3 p 63-6</sup> alludes to these as follows, together with a unique reading of Beza’s Greek Text in Revelation 16:5 preserved in the AV1611 as *“and shalt be.”*

*“Beza did introduce... ‘conjectural emendations,’ that is, changes made to the text without any evidence from the manuscripts. A few of these changes made it into the KJV, the most famous being Revelation 16:5, ‘O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be’ rather than the actual reading, ‘who art and who wast, O Holy one.’”*

*“The most famous of [Erasmus’s] textual errors [in Revelation] are found in Revelation 17. In verse 4 the scribe created a new Greek word... ‘akathartetos’ (the actual term is ‘akathata’), which is still to be found in the pages of the Trinitarian Bible Society’s Textus Receptus. And then there is Revelation 17:8, where the scribe mistakenly wrote... ‘and is not, and yet is,’ KJV for the actual reading... ‘and is not and will come,’ NASB...”*

*“The final six verses [Revelation 22:16-21] were absent from [Erasmus’s] lone manuscript...[Erasmus] translated the passage from the Latin Vulgate into Greek [and] made a number of mistakes. The amazing thing is that these errors continue in the Textus Receptus to this very day...[They] survived the editorial labours of Stephanus and Beza, to arrive unchanged...in the King James Version.*

*“Other places where Erasmus’ work, and hence the TR, fall short would include Revelation 1:6, where the KJV has ‘made us kings and priests,’ whereas the vast majority of manuscripts have ‘made us to be a kingdom of priests’ (NIV). Another place in the first chapter that should be significant to the KJV Only advocates is found in verse 8, where the KJV reads ‘saith the Lord’ while nearly every Greek manuscript reads as the NASB, ‘saith the Lord God’ ...”*

White notes<sup>3 p 87</sup> with respect to Revelation 1:8 that “*Only two miniscules do not have “God” at this point, Hoskier 141 and 187. As we will note, Hoskier is almost certainly a copy of Erasmus’ printed text, and is hence nearly worthless as a textual source (the same is true of Hoskier 57)...*”

And the evidence for this note is...? White fails to provide any. The evidence is to the contrary. This extract is from a forum<sup>69</sup> entitled *The Puritan Board – The Merits of the A.V.*

*“There are, however, at least three good reasons to doubt the validity of the story of Erasmus and his mutilated copy of Revelation: 1) the only evidence for it is that the manuscript apparently used by Erasmus for Revelation is missing its last page;\*\*\* 2) Erasmus’s Latin New Testament doesn’t agree with the Latin Vulgate in the last six verses of Revelation (a problem if his Greek text for those verses was derived from the Vulgate); and 3) there exists Codex 141.†*

*“H. C. Hoskier spent a lifetime collating every edition of Erasmus’s Greek New Testament, several other printed Greek New Testaments, and almost all of the known Greek manuscripts of Revelation. His study and collation of Revelation in Codex 141 surprised him, because it contained substantially the same text that appears in Erasmus’s Greek New Testament. In Hoskier’s own words:*

*““Upon reaching the end [of Revelation] and the famous final six verses, supposed to have been re-translated from the Vulgate into Greek by Erasmus when Codex I was discovered and found to lack the last leaf: the problem takes on a most important aspect. For if our MS. 141 is not copied from the printed text, then Erasmus would be absolved from the charge for which his memory has suffered for 400 years!*

*“In an effort to nullify the testimony of Codex 141, most “scholars” assign the manuscript a “young” age and simply claim that it is a copy of Erasmus’s (or Aldus’s or Colinaeus’s) printed Greek New Testament. But based on his study of the penmanship of the scribe who composed it, Hoskier determined that Codex 141 was executed in the 15<sup>th</sup> century — well before Erasmus’s Greek New Testament was printed; and based on his study of its contents (and the collation of same), Hoskier determined that MS 141 “has no appearance of being a copy of any [printed edition of the Greek New Testament], although containing their text (Coats’s emphasis).†† There is, then, manuscript evidence to support the supposed “Erasmian readings...”*

*“\*\*\* The audacity of “scholars” in speculating (and then basing theories and “facts”) on the contents of a missing leaf of a manuscript — or even in assuming that the leaf was missing when Erasmus used the manuscript (provided that this is the manuscript he used) — aptly demonstrates the reliability of such men in matters of scholarship.*

*“† The manuscript is listed under several call numbers. Under Hoskier’s, Scrivener’s and the Old Gregory classification systems, it is MS 141; under the New Gregory system it is 2049; and under von Soden’s system, it is w 1684. It is located in the Parliamentary Library in Athens.*

*“†† For full details, see H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen’s Third Edition, Together with the Testimony of the Versions, and Fathers; a Complete Conspectus of All Authorities, Vol. 1* (London: Bernard Quaritch, Ltd, 1929), pp. 474-477. It was also Hoskier who noted that Erasmus’s Latin New Testament differs from the Vulgate in the last six verses of Revelation.”*

White makes reference<sup>3 p 87</sup> to Hoskier's work, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*. Why did he not mention any of the above details from that work?

White also neglects to inform the reader that the NASV, along with the RV, NIV, JB, NWT – see *Appendix, Table A1* – omits the expression “*the beginning and the ending*” from Revelation 1:8. The modern versions follow<sup>62</sup> Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup>, who were unregenerate apart from Bishop Wordsworth – see remarks under *Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness*. Why should their version of Revelation 1:8 be accepted over that of the King James translators?

Moorman<sup>9 p 149</sup> shows that the AV1611 reading for Revelation 1:8 has significantly superior manuscript support than the modern omission.

He<sup>11 p 16ff</sup> describes how the AV1611 follows the Andreas line of manuscripts of the Book of Revelation, one of the two main streams of Greek sources for this Book – Revelation is unusual in this respect compared to the rest of the New Testament – the other is known as the 046 group. Moorman describes in detail how Hoskier and Schmid, the foremost scholars of the manuscript support for Revelation concluded unequivocally that the Andreas line is superior to the 046 line, numerically by over 100 manuscripts to 50, or approximately 2:1. Moorman cites Hoskier as follows.

“*I may state that if Erasmus had striven to find a text on the largest number of existing MSS in the world of one type, he could not have succeeded better...*” (author's emphasis).

And Moorman concludes, “*Here then is a powerful example of God's guiding providence in preserving the text of Revelation [in the KJV].*”

With respect to White's objection to the AV1611's omission of “*God*” in Revelation 1:8, the term “*The Lord*,” used overwhelmingly in the New Testament for the Lord Jesus Christ and the inclusion of the phrase that the modern versions omit, the AV1611 reading, “*I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty*” gives greater emphasis to the fact that *the Lord Jesus Christ* is God, as revealed in the Old Testament.

Compare Isaiah 44:6.

“*Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.*”

Moorman<sup>11 p 80</sup> notes that the AV1611 reading for Revelation 1:8 “*the Lord*” follows the Bibles of Tyndale - 1525, Great - 1539, Geneva - 1560 and the Bishops - 1568, along with the Greek editions of Stephanus - 1550, Beza - 1598 and Eleziever\* – 1624, along with manuscripts 429, 1894 and “*about 5 of Hoskier's cursives*,” i.e. not a mere “*two miniscules*” as White asserts – see above. \*Various spellings exist.

Again, the modern versions follow<sup>62</sup> Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth with respect to the addition of “*God*.”

But White continues.

“*Another important accidental deletion in the text of Revelation is found at the beginning of chapter 14...The name of the Lamb, identified by the phrase “His name and,” is not found in the TR. According to Hoskier, a grand total of six Greek manuscripts...all dating quite late (two of which are highly suspect), do not contain this phrase. The reason*

*for its non-inclusion is quite simple...The repetition of the phrase “his name and” caused those few scribes to omit the second occurrence...*

*“Two more interesting problems in the TR in Revelation should be briefly noted. The first is the addition of the phrase “him that liveth for ever and ever” at Revelation 5:14. This addition is found in only three suspect Greek manuscripts, but is absent from [Erasmus’s] manuscript. And in Revelation 15:3, “King of saints,” which should be either “King of ages” (NIV) or “King of the nations” (NASB), the TR ending again fails to have Greek manuscript support.*

*“The TR often gives readings that place it in contrast with the united testimony of the Majority Text...Often this is due to Erasmus’ importing of entire passages from the Latin Vulgate. This is how Erasmus came up with “the book of life” at Revelation 22:19 rather than the reading of the Greek manuscripts, “the tree of life.” Seemingly the edition of the Latin Vulgate that Erasmus used to translate the last six verses of Revelation into Greek contained this reading, and it survived...to end up serving as the basis of the KJV.”*

It should also be noted that the DR, JR, JB and NWT essentially agree with the NASV (White’s income source), NIV *against* the AV1611 in Revelation 1:6, 1:8, 5:14, 14:1, 15:3 (JB “nations,” others “ages” or similar), 16:5, 17:8, 22:19. Only the DR, JR give support to the AV1611 in Revelation 1:8a, 5:14 and 22:19 and the JB supports the AV1611 in Revelation 1:6. See **Appendix, Table A1**. Once again, this comparison prompts the question, why did God give His word to Rome and Watchtower but not to faithful bible believers – see above - if White is correct? Naturally, James White does not provide an answer.

In a note on his criticism of Revelation 16:5 in the AV1611, White states<sup>3 p 86</sup> that *“The KJV Only advocate who asserts the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Version has to believe that Theodore Beza, the successor of John Calvin, as strong a proponent of “Calvinism” as has ever lived (certain KJV Only advocates such as Peter Ruckman are strongly anti-Reformed), was divinely inspired to make the change without any manuscript support at all.”*

Note that White fails to name any “KJV Only advocate who asserts the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Version” and slyly shifts from ““Calvinism”” to “strongly anti-Reformed,” which is not the same as anti-““Calvinism,”” without substantiating this accusation against Dr Ruckman. This outburst is simply more of White following in the wake of those who **“with their tongues they have used deceit”** Romans 3:13.

But Dr Ruckman has some comments on Revelation 16:5, as follows. It is one of the seven verses<sup>2</sup> that James White challenged him to debate – and later reneged on the challenge. See **Introduction**. Luke 2:22, Jeremiah 34:16 and 1 John 5:7 will also be considered in this chapter. The remaining three verses; Acts 5:30, 19:37, Hebrews 10:23, will be considered in the next chapter, which will address White’s attack on **‘The King James Only Camp.’**

*“Since White wrote his book to justify the sins of the NIV and NASV committees, do you think he was actually worried about “shalt be” in Revelation 16:5? You see the “and” in the verse was found in an early papyrus (P 47): “and...” what? The NIV and the NASV and Nestle and Aland and Hort had to get rid of the earliest papyrus this time. It was an embarrassment because it messed up their sentence. If they had followed their profession (“the oldest and best, etc.) they would have had to give you this: “Righteous art Thou, the Being One, AND the One who was, AND the Holy One.” That is one awkward, cockeyed clause, so the “and” (“kai” in the papyrus) had to be dropped. Something originally fol-*

lowed that last “and,” and it certainly was not “the Holy One.” Undoubtedly, “in the original” (a famous, worn-out, Alexandrian cliché) it read “the One being, and the One who was, AND the One who shall be...

“Now, that is a conjecture, but it is a conjecture in the light of early Greek manuscript evidence that was discarded by Mr Nestle and Mr White. He and his buddies had to violate their own standards to get rid of the AV reading. Standard Operating Procedure in the Cult...

“They never waste their time on any text like they waste it on the English text of 1611. That is the one they hate...

“For those of you who think I am “overstepping” myself: Who inserted “nailed” into Acts 2:23 without being able to find one nail within one hundred verses of the verse (NASV)? There is not one Greek manuscript extant that says “nail” or “nails” or “nailing” or “nailed.” But it doesn’t bother any Alexandrian except in Revelation 16:5 in an AV. Remarkable, isn’t it?...

“We would judge White’s extant Greek texts on Revelation 16:5 to be defective, in regards to “shalt be,” and this is apparent from the rejected “kai” in Papyrus 47. Why trade in absolute truth for a defective Greek manuscript? The truth is the Lord (vs. 5) had THREE lives (confirmed in Revelation 1:8, 8:8) and the “kai” (and) is found in both those passages. Someone messed with Revelation 16:5 in the Greek texts. It wasn’t the AV translators...”

White is clearly being inconsistent in not highlighting the insertion of “nailed” in Acts 2:23, while complaining about Revelation 16:5 in the AV1611.

Moorman<sup>9 p 152</sup> notes that P47 contains the reading “the Holy One” but he adds<sup>11 p 102</sup> that “The KJV reading is in harmony with the four other places in Revelation where this phrase is found, 1:4, 8, 4:8, 11:17. Indeed Christ is the Holy One, but in the Scriptures of the Apostle John the title is found only once (1 John 2:20), and there, a totally different Greek word is used. The Preface to the Authorised Version reads: “With the former translations diligently compared and revised.” The translators must have felt there was good reason to insert these words though they ran counter to much external evidence. They obviously did not believe the charge made today that Beza inserted it on the basis of “conjectural emendation.” They knew that they were translating the Word of God, and so do we. The logic of faith should lead us to see God’s guiding providence in a passage such as this.”

The above would satisfy a bible believer with respect to Revelation 16:5 in the AV1611, though not James White.

Concerning the Greek terms to which White alludes above, both Vine<sup>70</sup> and Young<sup>71</sup> have the words ‘akathartos,’ adjective, meaning ‘unclean’ and ‘akathartes,’ noun, meaning “**filthiness**,” which the AV1611 uses in Revelation 17:4. Vine, who is no friend of the AV1611, simply notes that “[The] A.V. follows the texts which have the noun.” He gives no indication that the term was a scribal invention. Berry<sup>62</sup> indicates that the modern editors, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth used the adjective ‘akatharta,’ which Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition follows, thereby substituting for “**filthiness**” the weaker expression “the unclean things.”

Similar to the question posed above, why should the term approved by the King James translators be changed for one preferred by later editors, most of whom were unsaved?

Especially as the NIV reading “*filth*” approximates closely to that of the AV1611. Perhaps the answer lies partly in the fact that<sup>38</sup> “*James White is a consultant to the NASB revision, and therefore has a financial relationship with the Lockman Foundation.*” See remarks from that site in **Chapter 3**. The NASV adopts the reading “*the unclean things.*”

See also Kinney’s discussion<sup>5</sup>, of which an extract is given here, with author’s emphasis.

*“On page 64 of his book [White] criticizes this passage as found in the KJB by saying: “The most famous of these textual errors are found in Revelation chapter 17. In verse 4 the scribe created a new Greek word, never before seen, “akathartetos” - the actual term is “akatharta” - which is still to be found in the pages of the Trinitarian Bible Society’s Textus Receptus...”*

*“I have run into this false allegation by other Bible critics over the years. They tell us that there is no such Greek word as “akathartetos”, but according to several Greek lexicons there is such a word. There is a textual variant here with this word. It is ironic that the Greek text that underlies the UBS and the NASB, NIV, RSV versions is actually grammatically INCORRECT. The words “abominations and filthiness” should grammatically both be in the genitive case, and they are in the TR, but the Nestle text commits a blunder by placing “abominations” in the genitive, but gives a plural rather than a singular word [for “**filthiness**”], and places it incorrectly in the accusative case.”*

Concerning Revelation 17:8, where White insists<sup>3 p 64</sup> that “*And then there is Revelation 17:8, where the scribe mistakenly wrote “and is not, and yet is” KJV, for the actual reading “and is not and will come” NASB,*” Moorman notes that the Geneva and Bishops Bibles and Manuscript 2049, i.e. Hoskier’s manuscript 141, along with Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever read as the AV1611 and has the following comment<sup>11 p 103-4</sup>.

*“Keep in mind that the content of the reading is the future Tribulation (not John’s day). It strains the sense to be looking at something that “will come.” “Those who dwell on the earth will wonder...when they see the beast that...will come” (NASV). When the world looks at him he “is,” not “shall be.” A variant (kai peresti) read by Aleph-c, about 31 Andreas type mss., and the Syriac Sinaitic can translate virtually the same as the KJV. Aleph\*, [mss.] 1854, 2014, 2034, an early Armenian ms. would also translate about the same.”*

Note that in Moorman’s system of notation, Aleph-c refers to a correction in Codex Aleph and Aleph\* refers to an original reading in the document that was subsequently altered. It has been shown that, according to Scrivener, Aleph exhibits the marks of ten correctors. See Wilkinson’s remarks under **Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath**.

White would doubtless ignore Dr Moorman’s scriptural reasoning in support of the AV1611 or dismiss it as “*circular*” – see **Introduction**. He would also draw attention to the relatively few manuscript sources that support Revelation 16:5, 17:8 in the AV1611 - though 30-40 possible sources is not inconsiderable - but White is quite willing to dismiss<sup>3 p 38</sup> the overwhelming evidence<sup>9 p 131</sup> in support of “**and the Lord Jesus Christ**” in Colossians 1:2 as mere “*harmonization.*”

In other words, *any* reason for rejecting the AV1611 is good enough for James White. He is at least ‘consistent’ in that respect.

The modern reading “*and will come*” that White prefers again follows<sup>62</sup> Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth, “*and shall be present.*”



Dr Mrs Riplinger's observations<sup>39 p 952ff</sup> with respect to readings under consideration – and White's attempt to over-emphasise differences in various editions of the Received Text – should be kept in mind.

*“Neither Berry's edition of Stephanus nor Scrivener's edition should be used, as some do today, to ‘correct’ the KJV. These texts can create unnecessary confusion for students who have one of these two printed editions and are comparing it to the Received Text of the KJV...*

*“None of [the] microscopic differences between the KJV and today's printed one-man editions of the ‘Textus Receptus’ are of major consequence. They are insignificant compared to the thousands upon thousands of serious differences between the pure Textus Receptus text type and the corrupt new versions’ minority text type.*

*“Authority must remain with the Bible in use, not with the critical edition of one man or one ecclesiastical tradition. Scrivener's and Berry's printed editions are not ‘authoritative’ or to be regarded as ‘the Original Greek’ “in microscopic points of detail,” where they differ from the manuscript tradition or the King James Bible and other great vernacular Bibles (Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 2, p 499)...These particular editions were never read and used by the masses of Greek-speaking true Christians.*

*“It must be remembered that even the 5200 existing handwritten Greek manuscripts were the product of the **Greek Orthodox Church**. Its membership has never been made up of true believers. The scriptures have been entrusted to the priesthood of true believers, just as they were entrusted to the Hebrew priests in the Old Testament. Unbelievers, Greek speaking or otherwise, cannot discern spiritual things...*

*“The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to ‘the Greek’ and downplaying the common man's Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today's pseudo-intellectuals call ‘the critical text,’ ‘the original Greek,’ the ‘Majority Text,’ or the ‘Textus Receptus.’ There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no ‘Dead Bible Society’ to translate it into “everyday English,” using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors.*

#### **“What Would Jesus Do?**

- Inspire a Bible people can read?*
- Inspire conflicting Greek editions which few can read?*
- Inspire unsaved liberals to write conflicting Greek lexicons to translate conflicting one-man Greek editions?*
- Inspire originals then lose them?” (author's emphasis)*

Those are salutary remarks for all serious students of the bible translation issue. Again, it is a pity that James White despises both Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work. He is losing out greatly.

White's assertion that *“The final six verses [Revelation 22:16-21] were absent from [Erasmus's] lone manuscript...[Erasmus] translated the passage from the Latin Vulgate into Greek [and] made a number of mistakes”* has been countered elsewhere<sup>8 p 138-9</sup>, from which source, Dr Ruckman is quoted as follows.

*“The Greek text in this passage contains 135 words, of which Nestle (and Aland and Metzger) omits 17 words, adds 5 and alters 13, making a total of 35 words affected. Of these 35 words, 26 make no perceptible difference in an English translation, and most of the remaining 9 are of very small significance.... “them” (vs. 18), “paper” (vs. 19), “tree” (vs. 19), “and” (vs. 19), “even so” (vs. 20), “our” (vs. 20), “Christ” (vs. 21), “you” (vs. 21), and “amen” (vs. 9). (Trinitarian Bible Society, Oct.-Dec., 1964, Vol. 449, p. 14, 15)...On each one of those words Erasmus NOW has been supported by recent editors and translators.*

*“The Trinitarian Bible Society wisely noticed that... “the correctness of a very large proportion of the text of Erasmus is CONFIRMED and in the case of the few exceptions it cannot be shown with CERTAINTY that the modern CRITICS are RIGHT and Erasmus was WRONG”” (Dr Ruckman’s emphasis).*

James White certainly cannot – and does not. He merely asserts without proof that Erasmus’s text contains mistakes.

Dr Moorman gives the details of the support for and against the AV1611 readings<sup>11 p 113-4</sup> for Revelation 22:16-21. It should be noted again that the faithful forerunners of the AV1611, the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ Bibles, essentially follow the AV1611 readings as do the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever, indicating that the King James translators did give due consideration to “*the great vernacular Bibles,*” see Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks above, according to the statement in the Preface to the AV1611 that Dr Moorman has noted, “*With the former translations diligently compared and revised.*”

And Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 962</sup> adds that “*Erasmus wrote in his Preface that he consulted, not the Latin Vulgate, but [the] ancient Italic Bibles...dating back to the time of the apostles, [matching] Erasmus’ Greek New Testament and the King James Bible.*”

White is insistent<sup>3 p 56ff, 87</sup> that he has read Erasmus’s work. Why did he fail to mention that Erasmus consulted the Old Itala Bible? It appears once again that he is being ‘inconsistent,’ or perhaps he did not read Erasmus’s work as thoroughly as Dr Mrs Riplinger did. She continues.

*“The Latin readings Erasmus had for the book of Revelation date back to the first and second century, as evidenced by the still extant Old Itala manuscripts of the book of Revelation: c (6), dem (59), g (51), h (55), m (PS-AU spe), reg (T), t (56), and z (65).”*

She gives Professor Metzger of Princeton Theological Seminary as the source for this information. Metzger<sup>3 p 151</sup> is one of White’s allies in attacking the AV1611 as the pure word of God and one of the eminent scholars who endorses White’s book on the back cover. Yet Metzger’s disclosure about Erasmus’s Old Itala sources finds no place in White’s book. Again, he is being ‘inconsistent.’

Unlike the King James translators, who rightly followed Erasmus’s example in utilising these ancient sources, for as Wilkinson has noted, “*Waldensian influence, both from the Waldensian Bibles and Waldensian relationships, entered into the King James translation of 1611.*” See remarks under *Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare*.

White’s objection to the AV1611 reading in Revelation 1:8 – and the omission of “*the beginning and the ending*” that White overlooked, has been discussed above. Kinney answers White’s objection to Revelation 1:6 in the AV1611 as follows<sup>5</sup>.

*“Mr. White tells us on page 65: “Other places where Erasmus’ work, and hence the TR, fall short would include Revelation 1:6, where the KJV has “made US KINGS and*

priests”, whereas the vast majority of manuscripts have “made us to be a kingdom and priests (NIV).”

“Mr. White should know better than to say something like this. First of all, his own NASB and the NIV reject the “vast majority of manuscripts” easily 20 times as often than does the King James Bible. Secondly, it is not true that the vast majority of manuscripts say what he says they do. The Hodges- Farstad Majority is generally divided up into 5 sections called a, b, c, d and e. In the Hodges-Farstad edition the footnote tells us that sections d and e read “kings and priests” as does the KJB and many others. What is beyond all question is that Revelation 1:5 reads “WASHED us from our sins in his own blood” in the “vast majority of all manuscripts”, whereas Sinaiticus, A and C read as is found in the NASB, NIV, RSV - “LOOSED us from our sins in his own blood.” The hypocrisy and shell shuffling of men like James White boggles the mind.

“The online English Majority Text Version ([www.emtvonline.com/](http://www.emtvonline.com/)) reads just as it is found in the King James Bible. Revelation 1:5, 6 “and from Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the firstborn from the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth. To Him who loves us and who WASHED us from our sins in His own blood, and He made us KINGS AND PRIESTS to His God and Father, to Him be the glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen.”

““kings and priests” fits the context of Revelation 5:10 and 20:6, and is the reading of not only a very large portion of remaining Greek manuscripts, but also that of Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Bishops’ Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, Mace’s N.T. 1729, Wesley 1755, the Italian Diodati, the Spanish Sagradas Escrituras 1569, the Reina Valera of 1909 and 1960, the NKJV 1982, Green’s 1998 Modern KJV, Young’s, the KJV 21, the Afrikaans 1953, Dutch Staten Vertaling, Basque bible, and the Modern Greek version used in the Orthodox churches today.”

Again, White’s preferred modern reading “kingdom” is found<sup>62</sup> in Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth.

Concerning Revelation 14:1, where White declares that “According to Hoskier, a grand total of six Greek manuscripts...all dating quite late (two of which are highly suspect), do not contain this phrase. The reason for its non-inclusion is quite simple...The repetition of the phrase “his name and” caused those few scribes to omit the second occurrence...”

Kinney states.

“While we are here in Revelation 14 let’s look at Mr. White’s comment on Revelation 14:1. On page 65 he says: “Another important accidental deletion in the text of Revelation is found at the beginning of chapter 14.”

“The NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV, and the Catholic versions all contain a few words not found in the Greek texts used in the making of the King James Bible. The NASB reads: “ Then I looked, and behold, the Lamb was standing on Mount Zion, and with Him 144,000, HAVING HIS NAME and the name of His Father written on their foreheads.”

“James then goes to say that the omission of the words “having his name” is found in only six Greek manuscripts. Well, need I point out that 6 Greek manuscripts is far more support for the KJB reading than that of many readings found in such versions as the NASB, NIV and RSV?

“Not only does the King James Bible not contain the extra words of “having His name”, but so also do Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Bishops’ Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, Webster’s, Young’s, the NKJV 1982, Green’s Modern KJV, the KJV 21st Century,

*the Third Millennium Bible, Luther's German Bible, the Spanish Sagradas Escrituras of 1569, the Reina Valera of 1602, 1858 and 1909, the Dutch Staten Vertaling, and the Modern Greek version which is used by the entire Greek Orthodox church. The Greek texts of Stephanus, Beza, Eleziever and Scrivener do not contain these extra words Mr. White is so concerned about.*

*"To show the fickle inconsistency of scholars like James White it should also be pointed out that in Revelation 14:3 we read: "And they sung AS IT WERE a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, AND THE ELDERS: and no one could learn that song but the HUNDRED AND FORTY AND FOUR THOUSAND, which were redeemed from the earth."*

*In this verse the word for "as it were" (ως) IS FOUND in the TR and in the present Nestle-Aland, UBS Greek texts, A and C. But Sinaiticus omits the word and so do the NASB and NIV. Not only do the NASB, NIV not follow their own Nestle text, but the words "and the elders" ARE FOUND in the Majority text, but Nestle's and the NASB, NIV, RSV omit them. Then to top it all off, instead of reading "the 144,000 which were redeemed" Sinaiticus actually reads 141,000 while manuscript C has 140,000! "Now you see it, and now you don't."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger writes<sup>7 Part 6</sup>, with respect to a shorter work by James White attacking her book *New Age Versions* that he later expanded into *The King James Only Controversy*.

*"I demonstrated in Which Bible Is God's Word (p. 62) that White's assertion that "all the Greek texts read as new versions do in Rev. 14:1" was wrong. It [the AV1611 reading] is in MSS P, 1, 5, 34, 025, 141, 246, 2049, 2053, 2065, and 2255mg. He fixed that error, among others. Charges of misspelling vanish after his critique's thirty-some spelling errors were pointed out to him by readers. God forbids us to cast our pearls before swine, "lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you" (Matt. 7:6). I have seen a good sample of White's ability to "trample." His track record for 'rending' and bending, keeps me from personally sending him any pearls."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has cited 9-10 manuscripts [141 is 2049 – see note above from *The Puritan Board – The Merits of the A.V.*]. White's assertion of 4-6 manuscripts in support of the AV1611 is clearly wrong. Moorman notes with respect to the AV1611 reading for Revelation 14:1 that *"There is but one name of Deity on their foreheads. See [Revelation] 7:3, 9:4, also 3:12..."*

Like the other alterations to the AV1611 that White favours (for that reason), the modern addition follows<sup>62</sup> Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth.

With reference to Revelation 5:14, where White maintains that *"the addition of the phrase "him that liveth for ever and ever" at Revelation 5:14... is found in only three suspect Greek manuscripts, but is absent from [Erasmus's] manuscript"* Dr Moorman reveals once again that White has been 'economical with the truth.'

Moorman shows<sup>11 p 89-90</sup> that the AV1611 reading *"him that liveth for ever and ever"* is found in the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' Bibles, the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever and several Latin sources, besides manuscripts 296, 2045 and 2049 – which White describes as *"suspect,"* as usual without any evidence for his assertion. See comments above from *The Puritan Board*, about the authenticity of manuscript 2049, Hoskier's manuscript 141. Once again, the modern versions that White prefers follow Gries-

bach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth in omitting the expression<sup>62</sup>.

Moorman has this pertinent observation that escaped White's notice. *"As this worship is directed to the Lamb (vs. 13), a key statement about Christ's eternal being is struck out of the HF CR\* texts."*

\*The Hodges-Farstad Majority Text and the Critical Text of Nestle-Aland's 26<sup>th</sup> Edition and United Bible Societies 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. The NKJV mainly follows the HF text and the NIV, NASV, NRSV the Nestle-Aland UBS text.

In answer to White's accusation that *"in Revelation 15:3, "King of saints," which should be either "King of ages" (NIV) or "King of the nations" (NASB), the TR ending again fails to have Greek manuscript support,"* Kinney states<sup>5</sup>.

*"One of the silliest comments James makes is his criticism of the KJB reading found in Revelation 15:3. Here we read: "And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King OF SAINTS."*

*"James says on page 66 that King of saints "should be either "King of the AGES (NIV) or "King of THE NATIONS" (NASB), the TR's reading again fails to have Greek manuscript support."*

*"James is such a joker, isn't he? In his book he recommends three different versions as being "reliable and trustworthy" - the NASB, the NIV and the NKJV, yet all three of these "reliable versions" differ from each other, and every "erroneous" reading of the KJB in the book of Revelation that he discusses in his book is also found in the NKJV which he recommends! Then he now gives us two different versions with two different readings, and then lies when he says the KJB reading fails to have Greek manuscript support."*

*"According to Jack Moorman's book, When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text, on page 110\*, he gives the evidence for the reading found in the King James Bible, as well as that of Tyndale, Coverdale, Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Bible, Young's, Webster's, the Spanish Reina Valera 1909 and 1960, Luther's German Bible, the NKJV, KJV 21, Green's Modern KJV, and the Modern Greek version used throughout the Orthodox churches. This is the reading found in the Greek manuscripts of 296, 2049 and 2066. It is also the reading of the Greek texts of Stephanus, Beza, Eleziever, and Scrivener. "King of saints" is also quoted by various church fathers like Victorinus, Tyconius, Apringius, and Cassiodorus."*

\*Evidently the first edition. The second edition, used for this work, cites in support of the AV1611 reading Tyndale's, the Great, Geneva and Bishops' Bibles and the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever in addition to the older sources of manuscripts and church fathers but not the more modern sources.

*"Not even the modern versions agree among themselves. The UBS text says "king of NATIONS" and so read the NASB, NRSV, ESV, Jerusalem bible, and Holman Standard. However, versions like the Revised Version, the American Standard Version, RSV, Douay, and the NIV all read: "king of THE AGES".*

*Notice that the RV, and ASV read "king of the ages", but then the revision NASB changed this to "king of nations". The RSV read "ages" but the revisions of the RSV now read "nations". The Douay read "ages" but the other Catholic revision now says "nations". The NIV says "ages" too, but wait! Now the revision of the NIV has come out. It is called Today's NIV (TNIV of 2005) and it now reads: "king of the NATIONS". NONE of*

*the revisions agree with the previous versions, and yet Mr. White has the temerity to recommend three different bible versions, none of which agrees with the others, and then he lies to us about the KJB reading not having any Greek support. Would you trust this man to sell you a used car?"*

Moorman observes<sup>11 p 101</sup> with respect to this verse that *"At the time of the statement, Christ is king of saints. He has not yet returned; the nations have not yet acknowledged his kingship."*

The Lord imposes His kingship by force at the Second Advent. ***"The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power"*** 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9.

He will then rule ***"with a rod of iron"*** Psalm 2:9 ***"And the Lord shall be king over all the earth"*** Zechariah 14:9a but this is subsequent to Revelation 15:3, chronologically.

James White would note that the readings *"nations"* and *"ages"* are found in the margin of an AV1611 at Revelation 15:3 because he wishes to exaggerate<sup>3 p 77</sup> *"the importance of marginal notes in the KJV Only controversy"* in order to subvert belief in the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible as the pure word of God. This deceitful tactic of White's will be discussed later but it should be understood that the marginal notes in an AV1611 are *not* the text and simply indicate that alternative readings exist, in keeping with the transparent honesty of the King James translators. As Dr Moorman has shown and as a comparison of ***"spiritual things with spiritual"*** 1 Corinthians 2:13 confirms, the King's men inserted the *correct* reading into the text. (Had the marginal notes not been present, White would probably have accused the King James translators of dishonesty.)

The editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> have the reading *"nations,"* which White clearly prefers – because it differs from the AV1611 reading. (Once again, White's 'circularity'- of which he repeatedly accuses bible believers, see comments under **Introduction** and **White's Main Postulates Refuted** - is evident, i.e. the AV1611 reading differs from that of some other source, i.e. the oldest manuscripts, the (alleged) majority of manuscripts, one of Erasmus's editions of the TR, one or more of the modern versions; the reading of the 'other source' *must be* correct; why – because it differs from the AV1611 reading. This is blatant 'scholarship-onlyism,' as Dr Ruckman<sup>1</sup> has rightly described it.)

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes with respect to Revelation 15:3, her emphasis, *"Greek texts vary here. Westcott-Hort has aeon, Nestle-NASB has ethos (which they translate as 'pagans' elsewhere!), the Textus Receptus has hagios, translated elsewhere as 'holy'! Three different Greek words, as diverse as 'pagan,' 'nations' and 'holy saints' fractures the freshman fantasy of the original Greek."*

***"It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man. It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in princes"*** Psalm 118:8, 9.

And it is better to trust in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible than in the vicissitudes of modern scholarship. For example, White<sup>3 p 157-9</sup> states with respect to several verses where he accuses the AV1611 of *"parallel influence,"* his emphases, *"that in each instance where the NIV lacks a phrase in its text that is found in the KJV\*, that same material is found elsewhere in the NIV New Testament."*

But White does not apply the same standard to the AV1611. Jeremiah 10:7 states.

*“Who would not fear thee, O King of nations? for to thee doth it appertain: forasmuch as among all the wise men of the nations, and in all their kingdoms, there is none like unto thee.”* Jeremiah 10:7 would apply, prophetically, to the Second Advent. See comments on Psalm 2:9, Zechariah 14:9a above.

\*Again, as Dr Mrs Riplinger indicates (see **Author’s Introduction**), what if a native Christian on the mission field possessed only a portion of the New Testament, as many may well do? How does White overcome the disadvantage that believer faces with respect to the abbreviated New Testament of the NIV, versus that of the complete New Testament of the AV1611?

See also White’s comments<sup>3 p 137</sup> on Revelation 20:13, 14 and Dr Ruckman’s response<sup>1 p 271-2</sup>, also described in **Chapter 6**.

Concerning White’s statement that *“The TR often gives readings that place it in contrast with the united testimony of the Majority Text... Often this is due to Erasmus’ importing of entire passages from the Latin Vulgate. This is how Erasmus came up with “the book of life” at Revelation 22:19 rather than the reading of the Greek manuscripts, “the tree of life”* Kinney states<sup>5</sup>.

*“The last major complaint James has about the KJB that I wish to mention in this article is the oft repeated claim that in the final chapter of the book of Revelation the King James Bible tells us that for those who take away from the words of this book,” God shall take away his part out of THE BOOK of life.” James asserts that Erasmus got this reading, not from any Greek manuscript, but from the Vulgate, and that it should properly read “tree of life” as do the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV and Holman Standard.*

*“I have already put together an article dealing with this verse where I and others show that “book of life” is indeed found in some Greek manuscripts, in many Bible versions both old and new, (in English and many foreign languages), and is so quoted by various church fathers in their writings. It can be seen here:*

*“[www.geocities.com/brandplucked/booklife.html](http://www.geocities.com/brandplucked/booklife.html).”*

Will Kinney’s article explains the AV1611 reading in Revelation 22:19 as follows.

*“Rather than saying “book of life”, versions like the RSV, NASB, NIV, ESV, Holman Christian Standard, Jehovah Witness New World Translation, and the Catholic versions read: “God will take away his share in the TREE of life.”*

*“It should be noted that there are several textual differences found in just the last few verses of Revelation, and that not even the modern versions agree among themselves.*

*“For instance, in verses 20 and 21, the King James Bible as well as the Majority of all texts reads: “EVEN SO, come, Lord Jesus.” However Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus omit the word for “even so”, and so do the NASB, NIV, ESV, and Holman Standard.*

*“Again, in verse 21 in the KJB we read: “The grace of our Lord Jesus CHRIST be with YOU ALL. AMEN.” Here the word CHRIST is found in the Majority of all texts, but again Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus omit it, and so do the NASB, NIV, ESV, and Holman Standard.*

*“Then in the very last part of the last verse of Revelation, where the KJB says: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with YOU ALL, AMEN”, here Sinaiticus is different from all other texts, reading “with THE SAINTS”. The Revised Version, the American Standard Version, and the Revised Standard Version all read “with the SAINTS” (follow-*

ing *Sinaiticus*) while the NIV paraphrases the *Sinaiticus* reading as “with GOD’S PEOPLE”.

“However the NASB 1995 and the new 2001 ESV (English Standard Version) now reject *Sinaiticus* and go with *Alexandrinus* instead, which says: “with ALL” and omits the word “you”. But wait. The even newer ISV (International Standard Version), and the upcoming Holman Christian Standard have once again gone back to the *Sinaiticus* reading of “with the saints”. The modern versions don’t even agree among themselves.

“It is more than a tad hypocritical of Bible correctors to criticize the King James reading “book of life”, when the two other variant readings adopted by the conflicting modern versions of “with all” and “with the saints” are found ONLY in ONE manuscript each and, according to the UBS textual apparatus, not in any other ancient version or quoted by any church father...

“Many anti-King James Bible critics bring up “the book of life” as found in Revelation 22:19 as an error. One well known such critic is Doug Kutilek\*. His full article is found at this site

“[www.bible-researcher.com/kutilek1.html](http://www.bible-researcher.com/kutilek1.html)”

\*Kutilek is a close ally of James White, said by him<sup>3 p 121</sup> to be the author of “fine, ongoing work” i.e. spreading disbelief in the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible. Kutilek’s site, [www.kjvonly.org/index.html](http://www.kjvonly.org/index.html), is “dedicated to the defense of the Bible as originally written, against the flood of falsehood propagated by King James Onlyism.” Note, however, that “the Bible,” as such, was never “originally written,” in the sense of being compiled into one volume<sup>8 p 101</sup> (impossible with hand-written manuscripts) and therefore Kutilek is simply perpetuating the fable propagated by Princeton academics Hodge and Warfield<sup>39 p 553, 72 p 6, p 8</sup> that only ‘the originals’ were ‘inspired.’ Hodge and Warfield<sup>73 p 237-8</sup> stated their belief as follows, in an article entitled *Inspiration*. This author’s emphasis.

“All the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, **are without any error, when the ipsissima verba** [the precise words] **of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense.**”

All copies and therefore Bible translations are said to be “imperfect,” because “the original reading may have been lost.” Hodge and Warfield’s article has influenced most of the body of Christ since then. Few Christians actually believe that they possess “all scripture...given by inspiration of God,” 2 Timothy 3:16.

As Solomon rightly observed, “one sinner destroyeth much good” Ecclesiastes 9:18b.

And in this case, there were two – together with two more in the UK, Westcott and Hort, whose Revised New Testament appeared the same year as Hodge and Warfield’s article. The Devil was clearly at work on two academic fronts at the time, in the two leading Protestant nations.

Kinney continues.

“I have included only extracts from his main arguments, but I am by no means misrepresenting his views. Men like Mr. Kutilek [and James White] have no inspired, complete, inerrant Bible and they often resort to personal opinion presented as fact, and outright falsehood as though it were irrefutable evidence. Let’s read some of what he has to say and then we will respond to his criticisms.



*“In Mr. Kutilek’s article he says there are “a number of unique readings in Erasmus’ texts, that is, readings which are found in no known Greek manuscript but which are nevertheless found in the editions of Erasmus. One of these is the reading “book of life” in Revelation 22:19. All known Greek manuscripts here read “tree of life” instead of “book of life” as in the textus receptus. Where did the reading “book of life” come from? When Erasmus was compiling his text, he had access to only one manuscript of Revelation, and it lacked the last six verses, so he took the Latin Vulgate and back-translated from Latin to Greek. Unfortunately, the copy of the Vulgate he used read “book of life,” unlike any Greek manuscript of the passage, and so Erasmus introduced a “unique” Greek reading into his text.”*

*“First of all, Mr. Kutilek says there are no Greek manuscripts that read “book of life”. He is flat out wrong about this. Dr. Thomas Holland, Jack Moorman, Dr. H. C. Hoskier and many others have documented the textual evidence that exists for the reading of “book of life” as found in Revelation 22:19.*

*“Dr. Holland responds to this charge at his website -*

*“[www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/advanc01.htm](http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/advanc01.htm)*

*“There this question is posed and Dr. Holland responds:*

*“Question: “If the Textus Receptus is the error free text, then why are the last six verses of Revelation absent from the TR, yet present in the KJV? Did you know that for these verses, the Latin Vulgate was translated into English - a translation of a translation?”*

*“Dr. Holland replies: “The “TR” has the last six verses of Revelation in it. It is found in the editions of Erasmus, Beza, Stephanus, and the Elzevir brothers.*

*““Codex Ir, which was used by Erasmus, was missing Revelation 22:16-21 [it may not have been when Erasmus used this codex<sup>69</sup>]. The standard teaching is that Erasmus went back to the Latin Vulgate for these verses and re-translated them into Greek. However, Dr. H. C. Hoskier disagreed by demonstrating that Erasmus used the Greek manuscript 141 which contained the verses. (Concerning The Text Of The Apocalypse, London: Quaritch, 1929, vol. 1, pp. 474-77, vol. 2, pp. 454,635.)*

*““Regardless, the textual support for these verses is not limited to the Latin Vulgate. They are also found in the Old Latin manuscripts, additional early translations such as the Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic, and some later Greek manuscripts.*

*““Of course, the biggest “change” comes in verse 19. Dr. Hoskier has shown that Greek manuscripts 57 and 141 read with the Latin in stating “book of life” and not “tree of life” as found in Sinaiticus and most other Greek mss. There are, of course, other witnesses to the reading found in the KJV here. For example, the Old Bohairic Coptic version also reads “book of life.” Additionally, we have patristic citations from Ambrose (340-397 AD), Bachiarius (late fourth century), and Primasius in his commentary on Revelation in 552 AD. Thus, we have evidence of the KJV reading dating from before the Vulgate and maintained throughout Church history in a variety of geographical locations and various languages.””*

White repeats Kutilek’s falsehoods, in his notes<sup>3 p 87</sup> on this chapter, stating baldly that “The TR...often imports entire passages on the basis of the authority of the Latin Vulgate” and, with respect to the AV1611 reading for **“book of life,”** “there are no Greek manuscripts to support the reading.” Like Kutilek, White is “flat out wrong.” Indeed, he is “flat lying.” Kinney continues.

*“Mr. Jack Moorman, in his book [first edition] “When the KJV Departs from the ‘Majority’ Text”, says the reading of “book of life” is also found in the Coptic Boharic, the Arabic, the Speculum, Pseudo-Augustine and written as such in the Latin of Adrumentum 552, Andreas of Cappadocia, 614 Haymo, Halberstadt, Latin 841. “Book of life” is found in the Greek manuscripts of # 296, 2049, and in the margin of 2067.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 980</sup> adds manuscript 051. Kinney continues, first citing Dr Moorman.

*““Libro (book) is the reading of the Latin mss. Codex Fuldensis (sixth century); Codex Carolinus (ninth century); Codex Oxoniensis (twelfth to thirteenth century); Codex Ulfensis (ninth century); Codex Uallicellanus (ninth century); Codex Sarisburiensis (thirteenth century); and the corrector of Codex Parisinus (ninth century).”*

*“Secondly, Mr. Kutilek is very misleading when he says that Erasmus had no Greek texts to consult for the ending of Revelation and so he copied from the Latin Vulgate. It is well documented that Erasmus was exceedingly well acquainted with hundreds of Greek manuscripts from his extensive travels and studies. You can read more about this in a very informative article dealing with the question of Is the Received Text Based on A Few Late Manuscripts?*

*“[www.wayoflife.org/fbns/isthereceived.htm](http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/isthereceived.htm)*

*“Thirdly, in his article Mr. Kutilek also states as fact what is really unfounded conjecture when he says: “The fact that all textus receptus editions of Stephanus, Beza, et al. read with Erasmus shows that their texts were more or less slavish reprints of Erasmus’ text and not independently compiled editions, for had they been edited independently of Erasmus, they would surely have followed the Greek manuscripts here and read “tree of life.”*

*“This is pure guesswork on his part. Stephanus had access to many Greek manuscripts that Erasmus did not possess, as well as Beza. For example, Stephanus mentions and John Gill<sup>8 p 320</sup> confirms that the three heavenly witnesses of “the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one” of 1 John 5:7 was the reading found in 9 of the 16 Greek manuscripts Stephanus used, yet we do not have any of these Greek texts today. Earlier writers like Stephanus, Calvin, Beza often make references to the readings of old Greek manuscripts which we no longer possess...*

*“In summary, we see that the reading of “book of life” in Revelation does have some Greek manuscript support, as well as ancient versions and church Fathers.*

*“The Providence of God has seen fit to place this reading in most Bibles that have been used throughout history to reach millions for Christ. These include Wycliffe 1395, Tyn-dale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible, the Bishops’ Bible 1568, and the Geneva Bible 1587...It is also the reading of the 1569 and 1602 Spanish Reina Valera versions as well as its modern 1960 edition used throughout the Spanish speaking world.*

*“Martin Luther’s translation of 1545, using Greek texts before Stephanus’ 1550 edition, also reads “book of life”. I met a Russian pastor a couple years ago and asked him what his Russian Bible said here. He told me it reads book of life too. I also have a copy of the Modern Greek New Testament, used by the Orthodox churches in Greece today, printed in 1954 and the reading of Revelation 22:19 is “book of life”.*

*“Besides all these English, Spanish and Greek bibles, I have been able to confirm that the following Bible versions also read “book of life”: The Afrikaans Bible of 1953, the Albanian, the Basque New Testament (Navarro-Labourdin), the Dutch Staten Vertaling, the*

*Hungarian Karoli, the Icelandic Bible version, the Italian New Diodati, and the Douay-Rheims.*

*“Mr. Kutilek closes his article by saying: “Some writers calculate the differences between the two texts at something over 5,000, though in truth a large number of these are so insignificant as to make no difference in the resulting English translation. Without making an actual count, I would estimate the really substantial variations to be only a few hundred at most. What shall we say then? Which text shall we choose as superior? We shall choose neither the Westcott-Hort text nor the textus receptus as our standard text, our text of last appeal...we refuse to be enslaved to the textual criticism opinions of either Erasmus or Westcott and Hort or for that matter any other scholars, whether Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Burgon, Hodges and Farstad, or anyone else. Rather, it is better to evaluate all variants in the text of the Greek New Testament on a reading by reading basis, that is, in those places where there are divergences in the manuscripts and between printed texts, the evidence for and against each reading should be thoroughly and carefully examined and weighed, and the arguments of the various schools of thought considered, and only then a judgment made.”*

*“Do you see where Mr. Kutilek is coming from? He is his own Final Authority [like James White]. He has no inerrant, complete, inspired Bible to give you or recommend. He is like those of old of whom God says in the last verse of the book of Judges: “In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” Judges 21:25.*

*“There ultimately is no certain way of knowing what the “originals” really said, because we simply do not have them, and literally thousands of Greek copies have been lost to time and decay. The King James reading of “book of life” in Revelation 22:19 is not without textual support, be that of Greek copies, ancient versions, Latin manuscripts, early church fathers or modern English and foreign language versions.*

*“I and many thousands of other Bible believers have come to the conclusion that God meant what He said in His Book about His preserved words.*

*“Isaiah 40:8: “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.”*

*“Psalm 12:6-7: “The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.””*

Note in passing that Kutilek’s judgemental approach to the Holy Bible – see above – is, for obvious reasons, wholly inappropriate for any world-wide missionary endeavour, especially to parts of the developing world, where resources for bible distribution are severely stretched. See comments on James White’s preference for “multiple translations,” discussed at the close of **Chapter 1**.

It is reassuring that in His provision of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible as the purified and fully refined words of God, Psalm 12:6, 7, “without admixture or error<sup>34</sup>” and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, the Lord has patently ignored the likes of Kutilek and White. The AV1611 was translated into every major language before 1901 and into Chinese and Indian dialects long before 1890<sup>8 p 14</sup>.

Dr Moorman makes this observation<sup>11 p 114</sup> with respect to the AV1611 reading “**book of life**” in Revelation 22:19.

*“Each person has his own individual “part in the book of life”. But what are we to make of a man’s “part in the tree of life”? The revised reading lessens the impact of this last warning in the Bible. Also a parallel is intended “...this book...the book of life.”*”

It should also be noted<sup>62</sup> that the not-so-trustworthy editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth contain the alteration *“tree of life.”*

In addition to attacking various AV1611 readings in the Book of Revelation, White attempts in this chapter to subvert several other AV1611 readings, beginning<sup>3 p 58-9, 68</sup> with Romans 10:17, 12:11, 1 Timothy 3:16, Matthew 1:18, 20:22.

White states with respect to Romans 10:17 that *“Erasmus “guessed””* at what became the AV1611 reading **“word of God”** and tries to imply that the reading *“word of Christ,”* would be superior because it is found in some old sources, i.e. P46, Aleph and B.

Note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks at the beginning of this chapter, to the effect that what Erasmus *““guessed””* *“led him to the readings which match almost every Greek manuscript known today.”* This is certainly true of the AV1611 for Romans 10:17. White no doubt prefers the poorly attested reading *“word of Christ”* because it is found in White’s ‘preferred’ translations, the NIV and NASV. The NIV, NASV reading is also found in the DR, JR, RV, JB and with minor variation, i.e. *“word about Christ,”* the NWT.

The NIV, NASV and Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition follow the dubious editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>62</sup> for Romans 10:17.

The expression **“word of Christ”** occurs only once in the scriptures, in Colossians 3:16. Its use is appropriate here because the central theme of this Letter is the Lord Jesus Christ, of Whom Paul writes, **“For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily”** Colossians 2:9.

Dr Stauffer<sup>74, p 103</sup> notes with respect to Romans 10:17, *“I asked a group of young people what “the word of Christ” was, and they informed me it was contained only in the four Gospel books. One of them even said, “It is the red letters in the Bible.” Many of the publishers place the words of Christ in red. The NIV rendering of **Romans 10:17** indicates that the way for a person to receive faith is by simply reading the four Gospel books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John – the words spoken by Christ while on earth...Through diligent study, one can easily determine that our Apostle is Paul and the thirteen epistles bearing his name as their first word give us our primary doctrine. Satan wants our focus directed away from the Apostle Paul (**1 Corinthians 11:1, 2 Timothy 2:7**). The NIV actually elevates the earthly words of Christ above the rest of **His Word**. This is unscriptural and weakens one’s faith”* (author’s emphases).

It is regrettable that White didn’t carry out the same exercise with bible readers that Dr Stauffer did.

The expression **“word of God”** occurs 48 times in the scriptures and appropriately is often associated directly with the scriptures, e.g. Luke 4:4, 8:21, 11:28, John 10:35, Acts 13:34, 18:11, Romans 9:6, 10:17, 2 Corinthians 2:17, 4:2, Ephesians 6:17, 2 Timothy 2:9, Hebrews 4:12, 1 Peter 1:23, Revelation 1:2 etc. The expression is undoubtedly correct in Romans 10:17 and no saved sinner like James White (assuming he is such) has any business attempting to infer otherwise.

Of Matthew 1:18, which reads **“the birth of Jesus Christ,”** White states<sup>3 p 59</sup> *“In chapter 3 we noted how scribes could change a passage due to familiarity with a parallel account in another place, or due to their familiarity with the passage’s use in the church. Erasmus realized the exact same thing. With reference to the phrase “Jesus Christ” at Mat-*

*thew 1:18, Erasmus, noting that the Latin only had “Christ,” said, “However I suspect ‘Jesus’ was added by a scribe because the passage is customarily recited in this way by the church.”*”

White’s comments above demonstrate that he believes that the word “**Jesus**” as found in Matthew 1:18 in the AV1611 is a ‘scribal addition.’

So why doesn’t he criticise the editors of the NIV, NASV for agreeing with the AV1611 reading, as do the RV, JB and NWT? No doubt influenced by the Vulgate, the DR, JR alone of the versions used for comparison in this work, omit “**Jesus**” in Matthew 1:18. Of the critical editions, only Tregelles omits “**Jesus**” in Matthew 1:18.

Romans 12:11 is similar with respect to variant readings. White states that “[*Erasmus*] liked “*serving the time*” at Romans 12:11 rather than “*serving the Lord.*” He defended his choice by noting that the Greek terms for Lord (*kurios*) and time (*kairos*) could easily be confused because they look the same. This was true, “especially considering that copyists often abbreviate syllables in their writing.”

Again, why doesn’t White criticise the editors of the NIV, NASV for contradicting Erasmus’s “*choice,*” which, according to White, “*was true*”? These versions, together with the RV, DR, JR, JB, NWT have the AV1611 reading “***serving the Lord***” in Romans 12:11, with minor variation.

White is quick to point out that Stephanus’s Greek Edition reads “*kairos,*” “*time,*” but inspection of Berry’s Edition shows that the editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth read “*kurios,*” “*Lord*” together with the 1624 Edition of Eleziever<sup>62</sup>. Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition also has “*kurios,*” “*Lord.*” This level of agreement with the AV1611 reading, where even most of the modern editors didn’t believe that the reading “*kairos*” is worth pursuing, indicates that Erasmus’s opinion about the verse no longer applies. Like “*our critic,*”<sup>8 p 176</sup> White is a blind guide, gnat-straining, Matthew 23:24. He is again displaying both ‘inconsistency’ and ‘a double standard.’

Switching his attack to 1 Timothy 3:16, which attack he extends in a later chapter<sup>3 p 207-9</sup>, White states “*KJV Only advocates ridicule modern scholars when they point to the same facts that Erasmus did...to explain the difference between “God” and “He” at 1 Timothy 3:16.*”

White actually agrees with the AV1611 reading “***God was manifest in the flesh,***” for 1 Timothy 3:16 in his detailed comments on this passage. However, he is quick to try to justify the substitution of “*He*” for “***God***” in the NASV, NIV, stating that “*none of this requires us to believe that there is some conspiracy on the part of the modern translations with reference to their rendering of the disputed phrase in this passage...There is a very clear logical reason why these versions read as they do.*”

There is also “*a very clearly logical reason why*” the AV1611 reads as it does, apart from the weight and variety of underlying evidence – see below. Dr Moorman explains<sup>9 p 135</sup>, his emphases.

*“There is no mystery about “he appeared in a body.” The same can be said for everyone else! It is only a great mystery of godliness if “he” is God.” In fact, despite the NIV, NASV translation it is not even “he” but rather hos – “who was manifested in the flesh.” “He” is not in the text! This leaves the textual critic with an incomplete sentence which does not connect grammatically. To get around the difficulty it is suggested (without evidence) that Paul was quoting from the fragment of an early Christian hymn from which the “he” was missing...My, we will weave our webs!*

*“The passage is perhaps the strongest in Scripture on the Deity of Christ and we are not surprised that it is the object of Satan’s attack...”*

To return to White, he spends two pages in an effort to prove that  $\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$  for **“God”** in the Greek manuscripts could easily be written instead as  $\Theta\Sigma$  or **“He who”** - according to White. White then asserts that *“When we see, then such claims as that provided by Barry Burton [Let’s Weigh the Evidence, Chick Publications], “The NAS CHANGES it to... ‘He who was revealed in the flesh, Was vindicated in the Spirit...” we can recognise that there has not been a “change” at all, but that the particular translation being examined uses a Greek text that feels that  $\Theta\Sigma$  is the stronger reading than  $\overline{\Theta\Sigma}$ ...And, we might note that such versions as the NIV and the NASB provide textual footnotes that indicate the reading of “God”...something that most KJV Only advocates would never want to see in their KJVs when the manuscripts provide a different reading...”*

Not when the different reading is wrong, no. The sources in support of the AV1611 reading have been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 45, 84-6, 323-6, 9 p 135</sup>.

Note that *“our critic”* disagrees with White with respect to the AV1611 reading. He insists, *“The manuscript evidence is decidedly in favour of “He”.*” If two supposedly learned supporters of the modern versions are in disagreement over a reading of such import as **“God”** versus **“He,”** where does that leave the ordinary believer?

As Spurgeon said in his final address to his students, April 1891, speaker’s emphases, *“We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized that only a few of the most profound will know what is Bible and what is not, and they will dictate to the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than their accuracy.”*

The following comments from the first listed source, in answer to *“our critic,”* are relevant to White’s comments. This author’s emphasis.

*“None of the manuscript evidence is in favour of “He”. ALL the manuscript evidence is in favour of either “God” or “Who” or “Which”. I [have] described...how “THEOS” or “God”, which is found in the majority of manuscripts and is written “THS”, can easily be changed into “OS”, “Who”, or “O”, “Which”...*

*“Gail Riplinger states [New Age Versions] p 353 “Those few copies\* that have “who” in place of “God” do not have a complete sentence. There is no subject without “God”. In addition, a neuter noun “mystery” cannot be followed by the masculine pronoun “who.” To avoid having a clause with no subject, the NIV and JW bible arbitrarily drop the word “who” and invent a new word, “He”...By making these additions and subtractions, the new versions, in 1 Timothy 3:16, follow no Greek manuscripts at all...”*

\*She alludes to 5 out of 300. See Dr Ruckman’s remarks following on the ASV reading of 1901, amended further by the NASV to make a complete sentence.

*“Dr. Hills states [The King James Version Defended] p 138 “But if the Greek is “who”, how can the English be “He”? This is not translation but the creation of an entirely new reading.”*

*“Concerning the versions, Burgon [The Revision Revised] p 426, 448 shows that the Old Latin does NOT bear witness to “He” but rather to “O”, “which” and that “From a copy so depraved, the Latin Version was altered in the second century.” See Hills, above. The TBS Publication No. 10, p 8, states “While the Syriac “Peshitto” version has been justly described as “the oldest and one of the most excellent of the versions...It was evidently influenced by Greek manuscripts like Codex D and the Latin versions, which have “which*

was manifested"...It is probable that the earliest Syriac copies had "God was manifested."

"One of the Syriac versions which was remarkable for its literal adherence to the Greek was attributed to Philoxenus Bishop of Hierapolis in Eastern Syria, A.D. 488-518. This version actually includes the name of God in 1 Timothy 3:16 and indicates that Philoxenus found "God" in the Greek or Syriac copies in his hands."

The editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> unite in substituting "Who" for "**God**" in 1 Timothy 3:16 and are copied by Nestle.

Dr Ruckman comments as follows<sup>1 p 38ff</sup> on White's evaluation of "**God**" versus "*He*" in 1 Timothy 3:16, author's emphases. (Dr Ruckman also includes all the evidence for the readings "**God**" or "*Who*" in 1 Timothy 3:16.)

"The passage before us (1 Tim. 3:16) speaks of Jehovah-God becoming incarnate in the flesh. This is the verse that [in 1857] Jonathan Philpott (The Gospel Standard) prophesied would be meddled with if ANY revision of the AV was attempted by anybody...In 1881, Hort did just that. Nestle, Aland, and Metzger followed him; and, in this century, the ASV (!901), the NASV (1960), and the NIV (1973), did the same thing. James White justifies "**God**" being removed from 1 Timothy 3:16...White says "none of this requires us to believe that there is some conspiracy on the part of the modern translations with reference to their rendering of the disputed phrase in this passage."

"He lied right off the bat. He lied twice. The conspiracy was "in evidence" more than seventeen centuries ago\*, when no modern translation was in sight. No "PHRASE" was disputed at all. A word was disputed: "**God**"

\*Dr Mrs Riplinger cites six of the church fathers bearing witness to "**God**" in 1 Timothy 3:16 before 400 AD and adds that "Of writers before AD 400, Origen, the exiled heretic, stands alone in omitting "God." Dr Ruckman continues.

"It is true that the NIV and NASV invented a phrase or two ("*He appeared in a body*" and "*He who was revealed in the flesh*"), but the dispute was over who it was that was revealed. The AV said it was "**God**." [White said] "There is a very clear logical reason why these versions read as they do."

"Lied again. Three times in one paragraph.

"The NIV was one of the versions. But it said "*He*" for "**God**." There is no "*he*," sonny, in any Greek manuscript. There is no "*he*" in any Greek "family" or "text type" or "variant." The word "*He*," Jimmy..., is "*autos*"; it isn't found in ANY Greek text. But it is clear and LOGICAL," is it? "*O*"...is not "*he*." [It] is a neuter article\*. The NIV reading was plucked out of pure Pixie dust; not one of three hundred Greek manuscripts says "*he*." White just corrected "the Greek" with the NIV English, and did it while condemning the practice...Read Romans 2:19-22!..."

\*It appears that omicron O, o, is shown to represent either the neuter definite article or the relative pronoun *which*, depending on how it is accented<sup>71</sup>. Note also Dr Ruckman's observation, from inspection of a photocopy of Sinaiticus, that James White is not correct in his use of ΘΕΟΣ, ὉΣ and ΟΣ. These terms appear in the upper case manuscripts as ΘΕΟC, ὉC and ΟC respectively. Note that this author's earlier work<sup>8 p 45</sup> should also be corrected in this respect ☹. See also Burgon<sup>13 p 426</sup>. Dr Ruckman continues.

"The apostates before White's day (the ASV of 1901) ...were so rabid to remove "God" from the verse they constructed an English" sentence" that had a subject but no predi-

cate!... White didn't even dare mention it; he was too full of "truth and honesty"!<sup>3 p 13</sup> The ASV of 1901 violated the grammar of Third Grade English\*, so their "godly" successors had to cover up for them. They did it (NASV) by adding a verb ("was vindicated in the Spirit") where there wasn't one single "variant" reading that way..."

\*1 Timothy 3:16 in the ASV of 1901 reads, "He who was manifested in the flesh, Justified in the spirit, Seen of angels, Preached among the nations, Believed on in the world, Received up in glory." The verse does not constitute a complete sentence. The 1881 RV reading of Westcott and Hort is the same as that of the 1901 ASV and likewise grammatically incorrect. Dr Ruckman continues.

"White didn't mention either of these makeshift devices which had to be invented to get rid of the Deity of Christ (ASV and NASV) and bow down to the reading of Sinaiticus [Aleph]. He said they were "clear and logical" reasons..."

"[White] says [the modern translators] were not led by Satan; no conspiracy could be found among them... But he didn't dare document anything. We just did it. We will do it again..."

"**"God"** was omitted from 1 Timothy 3:16 by someone who majored in omissions when they quoted Scripture (Luke 4:10).

"Now there follows a brief mention of the "nomina sacra," which simply means that certain words like "God," "Jesus" and "Christ" were abbreviated in the corrupt "great uncials." A line would be written over the first letter to show that the abbreviation had taken place. In this case, "Theos" in the manuscripts appears as ( $\overline{\Theta\varsigma}$ ) with a line over the letters..."

"Here is Sinaiticus, without ONE item of information given about it [by White], while it has removed "God" from 1 Timothy 3:16. Canon Cook says that Sinaiticus was written at Caesarea by Eusebius, "the STANDARD bearer of the Arian HERESY" and Scrivener says of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus: "They contain unpardonable BLUNDERS... corrupt documents... LOGICALLY incompatibles with faith in the Saviour's Divinity."

"Clear and logical" reasons is it Jimmy, for the corrupt NASV reading?..."

"So it is easy to see how Theta ( $\Theta$ ) could be mistaken for Omicron (O)." [White inserts the verse in uncial Greek without word separation, once with  $\overline{\Theta\varsigma}$  and in parallel with  $\Theta\varsigma$ .] It could? If it had been, you couldn't have read "he," for  $\Theta\varsigma$  is not "He," and O, without the sigma (C or  $\Sigma$  or  $\varsigma$ ), is an article. It couldn't have been translated as "he" or "he who." And what would a LINE be doing ("nomina sacra") over  $\Theta\varsigma$  ( $\overline{\Theta\varsigma}$ )? There are no nomina sacras abbreviated as...  $\Theta\varsigma$ . Every scribe for nineteen centuries knew there weren't any. What White means is that "who" ( $\Theta\varsigma$ ) is a possibility because it is found in Sinaiticus [White's "great treasure"<sup>3 p 33</sup>]... Someone (NIV and NASV) deliberately chose the outrageous reading of a [conspiratorial] copyist [Aleph] in order to get read of "God"...

"On goes [James White].

"Hence WE can see how a textual variant arose at this point merely by the fact that human beings with less than perfect vision were copying words that are liable to cause confusion on the part of a person... who is not paying close attention [to the copying of God's word?]. ... a scribe might believe... fully and completely in the deity of Christ but may still



*see ΟΣ and copy it as such. No theological bias needs to be asserted to understand how this reading could arise."*

*"He didn't see the nomina sacra? So he thought a neuter antecedent ("the mystery of Godliness") required a MASCULINE pronoun (ος)?*

*"And he went to college in Alexandria? What kind of faculty did they have there?..."*

*"These clumsy perverts made three errors on one word in English where the word was "God" (and the verse dealt with the first fundamental of the faith), and Satan wasn't present at this sideshow? That is Alexandria. That is "Scholarship Onlyism." You are to believe "no theological bias" was present although they altered the gender, ignored the correct reading, added a verb and then lied about the problem. If it had been "HE WHO" [Aleph] what on "God's earth" would that have meant?...All human beings become "manifest in the flesh." Who didn't know that who had an IQ of 70? I know! Someone who trusts NIVs and NASVs..."*

*"But White's lame alibis for blasphemers has a much deeper source. You see, he never mentioned ALEXANDRINUS (manuscript "A")..."*

*"Every man on the...NASV committee...and the NIV committee, knew it was "Theos" with the nomina sacra (ΘC), and NOT "ος" or "o." Some "careless scribe" in AD 330 was not even a factor in the problem. Alexandrians never face issues."*

Dr Ruckman then gives extensive documentation to show how the letter Θ was visible as such in the 5<sup>th</sup> century Codex Alexandrinus<sup>65 p 170</sup> for over 100 years, 1628-1738, until it finally faded. He concludes.

*"The real reason for the NIV's and NASV's rejection of "God" had nothing to do with any "scribe" mistaking anything for anything. The blasphemous text of the NIV and NASV was adopted because it was (1) "The most difficult reading"...and (2) Because "doctrinal passages" are "suspect." Those were two of the traditional dogmatic decrees established by Hort to hog-tie a scholar when he approached a Greek Text. They were laid down by Griesbach and Lachmann before Hort adopted them..."*

*"James White was incapable of even discussing 1 Timothy 3:16...His vastly reduced "thumbnail sketch" of 1 Timothy 3:16 dealt with only ONE problem and he LIED about that one. That is how you qualify for the Scholars' Union."*

*"They are "looking for a few good liars." You have to attack ONE BOOK (and one book only) to qualify, and you have to lie about it when you attack it."*

A lengthy citation has been given from Dr Ruckman's work because later in his book, James White<sup>3 p 109ff</sup> attacks Dr Ruckman for "spearheading the KJV Only Movement" with arguments that "simply don't hold water" and "argumentation...circular at best, and often grossly flawed."

The above citation from Dr Ruckman's work and others elsewhere in this work should indicate to anyone genuinely concerned for "truth and honesty"<sup>3 p 13</sup> that Dr Ruckman's analyses of scripture texts and sources is profoundly insightful and that White's calumny of Dr Ruckman's writings, which will be addressed in more detail in the next chapter, is wholly unfounded. White is also clearly upset by what he terms Dr Ruckman's "insulting, demeaning language at his opponents," like James White.

An inspection of Dr Ruckman's comments on James White and his speculations will demonstrate for anyone concerned for "truth and honesty" that James White deserves all

of Dr Ruckman's censure that he gets and more, just as the scribes and Pharisees merited the rebukes they got from the Lord Jesus Christ, Matthew 23:13-33.

As Paul rightly rebuked an inveterate deceiver of his day, "***Wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?***" Acts 13:10b.

White then attempts to use Erasmus's notes on Matthew 20:22 in order to bolster up his speculations on "*harmonization*" in the AV1611 and therefore cast further doubt on its text.

*"Erasmus recognised correctly, the appearance of "harmonization" between parallel passages in the Gospels... One clear example of this is found in Matthew 20:22 where the KJV has, "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptised with?" The NASB [of which revision committee White is a paid consultant – see Chapter 3] has simply, "Are you able to drink of the cup that I am about to drink?" While Erasmus kept the phrase "and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptised with" in his text, he noted that it appeared to have been "transferred" from the parallel passage in Mark 10:38."*

White neglects to mention that the DR, JR, JB, NWT agree with the NASV, NIV in omitting the phrase "***and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with***" from Matthew 20:22. See *Appendix, Table A1*. He also neglects to mention that the NASV, NIV, DR, JR, JB, NWT likewise unite in omitting the phrase<sup>8 p 62</sup> "***and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with***" from Matthew 20:23. Both omissions in the modern versions stem from the corrupt Greek editions<sup>62</sup> of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth, copied by Nestle. Were both phrases "*transferred*" from Mark 10:38, 39 or simply recorded by Matthew and Mark?

Dr Moorman shows<sup>9 p 70</sup> that the phrases found in the AV1611 have support from 22 of the uncial manuscripts and the majority of the cursives, together with the 2<sup>nd</sup> century Peshitta Syriac and portions of the Old Latin. Why would the majority of scribes, working over a wide geographical area from earliest times, opt for 'transfer' of the phrases instead of simply copying? How does White know that those copying Matthew first consulted Mark before undertaking their work? White doesn't attempt to address these questions but they are relevant.

Aleph, B and 5 other uncials omit the phrases, which are absent from most of the Old Latin – Moorman cites 14 manuscripts – *and Jerome's Vulgate*.

Dr Ruckman<sup>33 p 98-9</sup> has this observation. Emphases are his.

*"There are two types of Old Latin readings: European and African. The old European (Note: "Italy" – Itala) was the type Jerome (from ITALY) used to bring the Old Latin into line with the Pope (who was in ITALY). Any "Old Itala" would have been the right "Old Latin" BEFORE JEROME MESSED WITH IT, and consequently, any Old Latin would have been the right text in Africa before ORIGEN messed with it. Thus Jerome, Origen, and Augustine stand perpetually bound together as an eternal memorial to the depravity of Bible rejecting "Fundamentalists," who enthrone their egos as the Holy Spirit."*

Like James White. Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>39 p 963</sup>.

*"Jerome corrupted [the] pure Old Itala Bible in the fourth century. He admitted in his Preface. "You [Pope Damasus] urge me to revise the Old Latin and, as it were, to sit in judgment on the copies of Scriptures which are now scattered throughout the world... Is there not a man, learned or unlearned, who will not, when he takes the volume in hand... call me a forger and a profane person for having had the audacity to add anything*

*to the ancient books, or to make changes...” In Jerome’s Prologue to the Catholic Epistles, “Preserved in the Codex Fuldensis”...he admits that Christians “have pronounced to have me branded a falsifier and a corrupter of the Sacred Scriptures”...Even Metzger admits, “Jerome’s apprehension that he would be castigated for tampering with the Holy Writ was not unfounded. His revision of the Latin Bible provoked both criticism and anger, sometimes with extraordinary vehemence.””*

White fails to mention Metzger’s admission anywhere in his book, although he repeatedly cites Metzger when he seeks to cast doubt<sup>3 p 179, 185, 252, 261, 263, 264, 266</sup> on readings in the AV1611. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments above on Revelation 22:16-21 with respect to Professor Metzger and Wilkinson’s remarks under **White’s Introduction** about the savage persecution Rome meted out to the Waldensian believers whose bible was the Old Itala, dating from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD.

White then directs his criticisms<sup>3 p 60-62</sup> towards 1 John 5:7.

He seeks to undermine the authenticity of this verse mainly by reference to Erasmus’s doubts about the passage. He states that “[1 John 5:7]...was found only in the Latin Vulgate. Erasmus rightly did not include it in the first or second editions...he was constrained to insert the phrase in the third edition when presented with an Irish manuscript that contained the disputed phrase...the manuscript is highly suspect, in that it was probably was created in the house of Grey Friars, whose provincial, was an old enemy of Erasmus...we have a phrase that is simply not a part of the ancient Greek manuscripts of John’s first epistle. The few manuscripts that contain the phrase are very recent, and half of those have the reading written in the margin. The phrase appears only in certain of the Latin versions. There are, quite literally, hundreds of readings in the New Testament manuscript tradition that have better arguments in their favor that are rejected by both Erasmus and the KJV translators. And yet this passage is ferociously defended by KJV advocates to this day...If indeed the Comma was a part of the original writing of the apostle John, we are forced to conclude that entire passages, rich in theological meaning, can disappear from the Greek manuscript tradition without leaving a single trace...the defenders of the KJV...[present] a theory regarding the NT text that in reality, destroys the very basis upon which we can have confidence that we still have the original words of Paul or John...in their rush to defend what is obviously a later addition to the text that entered into the KJV by unusual circumstances.”

Again, White neglects to mention where “the original words of Paul or John” can be found as the preserved words of God between two covers. He adds a note<sup>3 p 85-6</sup> with respect to “the grammatical argument that posits a problem in the masculine form of “three” and the genders of Spirit, blood and water” and insists that “This is not a very major problem, as “three” almost always appears in the NT as masculine when used as a substantive...this is more stylistic than anything else.”

First, White has demonstrated his contempt for, or wilful ignorance of, faithful bible believers such as the Waldenses, whose pre-1611 Latin Bibles, the texts of which date from as early as 157 AD, furnished “unequivocal testimony of a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church, that the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses [1 John 5:7] was adopted in the version which prevailed in the Latin Church, previously to the introduction of the modern Vulgate.” See Wilkinson’s citation of Nolan, under **Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare**.

How can a text of scripture preserved by “a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church,” possibly be a late addition? 157 AD is *not* late!

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes<sup>39 p 946</sup> that *“The world’s leading Erasmusian scholar, Henk de Jonge, finds Bruce Metzger, James White, and others sorely wrong in their appraisal of Erasmus. He states, in his “Erasmus and the Comma Johannem,” that White’s assertions are patently wrong.”*

The evidence for 1 John 5:7 as scripture has been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 88-9 319ff</sup> but extracts follow, together with citations from other researchers.

Dr Holland<sup>4</sup> states in refutation of White’s disinformation about 1 John 5:7 that *“Another example of false information is White’s treatment of the “Johannine comma” (1 John 5:7). “If indeed the Comma was a part of the original writing of the apostle John, we are forced to conclude that entire passages, rich in theological meaning, can disappear from the Greek manuscript tradition without leaving a single trace” (p. 62). “Without a trace? White thinks it was added in the fifteenth century. Yet, it was quoted by Cyprian in 250 AD, used by Cassiodorus in the early sixth century, and found in the old Latin manuscript of the fifth century and in the Speculum.”*

He has this further detailed study<sup>55 p 163ff</sup> as follows. Dr Holland’s book contains reference citations that have been omitted here.

Note that Dr Holland in his overview of 1 John 5:7 does *not* accept White’s assertion that the grammatical difficulty arising from omission of the verse *“is not a very major problem.”*

*“1 John 5:7 (Johannine Comma) - “These Three Are One”*

*““For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.”*

*“The passage is called the Johannine Comma and is not found in the majority of Greek manuscripts. However, the verse is a wonderful testimony to the Heavenly Trinity and should be maintained in our English versions, not only because of its doctrinal significance but because of the external and internal evidence that testify to its authenticity.*

*“The External Support: Although not found in most Greek manuscripts, the Johannine Comma is found in several. It is contained in 629 (fourteenth century), 61 (sixteenth century), 918 (sixteenth century), 2473 (seventeenth century), and 2318 (eighteenth century). It is also in the margins of 221 (tenth century), 635 (eleventh century), 88 (twelfth century), 429 (fourteenth century), and 636 (fifteenth century). There are about five hundred existing manuscripts of 1 John chapter five that do not contain the Comma. It is clear that the reading found in the Textus Receptus is the minority reading with later textual support from the Greek witnesses. Nevertheless, being a minority reading does not eliminate it as genuine. The Critical Text considers the reading Iesou (of Jesus) to be the genuine reading instead of Iesou Christou (of Jesus Christ) in 1 John 1:7. Yet Iesou is the minority reading with only twenty-four manuscripts supporting it, while four hundred seventy-seven manuscripts support the reading Iesou Christou found in the Textus Receptus. Likewise, in 1 John 2:20 the minority reading pantes (all) has only twelve manuscripts supporting it, while the majority reading is panta (all things) has four hundred ninety-one manuscripts. Still, the Critical Text favors the minority reading over the majority in that passage. This is commonplace throughout the First Epistle of John, and the New Testament as a whole. Therefore, simply because a reading is in the minority does not eliminate it as being considered original.*

*“While the Greek textual evidence is weak, the Latin textual evidence for the Comma is extremely strong. It is in the vast majority of the Old Latin manuscripts, which outnum-*

ber the Greek manuscripts. Although some doubt if the Comma was a part of Jerome's original Vulgate, the evidence suggests that it was. Jerome states:

*“In that place particularly where we read about the unity of the Trinity which is placed in the First Epistle of John, in which also the names of three, i.e. of water, of blood, and of spirit, do they place in their edition and omitting the testimony of the Father; and the Word, and the Spirit in which the catholic faith is especially confirmed and the single substance of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is confirmed.”*

*“Other church fathers are also known to have quoted the Comma. Although some have questioned if Cyprian (258 AD) knew of the Comma, his citation certainly suggests that he did. He writes: “The Lord says, ‘I and the Father are one’ and likewise it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, ‘And these three are one’.” Also, there is no doubt that Priscillian (385 AD) cites the Comma:*

*“As John says “and there are three which give testimony on earth, the water, the flesh, the blood, and these three are in one, and there are three which give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one in Christ Jesus.”*

*“Likewise, the anti-Arian work compiled by an unknown writer, the Varimadum (380 AD) states: “And John the Evangelist says... ‘And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one’.” Additionally, Cassian (435 AD), Cassiodorus (580 AD), and a host of other African and Western bishops in subsequent centuries have cited the Comma. Therefore, we see that the reading has massive and ancient textual support apart from the Greek witnesses.*

*“Internal Evidence: The structure of the Comma is certainly Johannine in style. John is noted for referring to Christ as “the Word.” If 1 John 5:7 were an interpretation of verse eight, as some have suggested, than we would expect the verse to use “Son” instead of “Word.” However, the verse uses the Greek word logos, which is uniquely in the style of John and provides evidence of its genuineness. Also, we find John drawing parallels between the Trinity and what they testify (1 John 4:13-14). Therefore, it comes as no surprise to find a parallel of witnesses containing groups of three, one heavenly and one earthly.*

*“The strongest evidence, however, is found in the Greek text itself. Looking at 1 John 5:8, there are three nouns which, in Greek, stand in the neuter (Spirit, water, and blood). However, they are followed by a participle that is masculine. The Greek phrase here is oi marturountes (who bare witness). Those who know the Greek language understand this to be poor grammar if left to stand on its own. Even more noticeably, verse six has the same participle but stands in the neuter (Gk.: to marturoun). Why are three neuter nouns supported with a masculine participle? The answer is found if we include verse seven. There we have two masculine nouns (Father and Son) followed by a neuter noun (Spirit). The verse also has the Greek masculine participle oi marturountes. With this clause introducing verse eight, it is very proper for the participle in verse eight to be masculine, because of the masculine nouns in verse seven. But if verse seven were not there it would become improper Greek grammar.*

*“Even though Gregory of Nazianzus (390 AD) does not testify to the authenticity of the Comma, he makes mention of the flawed grammar resulting from its absence. In his Theological Orientations he writes referring to John:*

*““(he has not been consistent) in the way he has happened upon his terms; for after using Three in the masculine gender he adds three words which are neuter, contrary to the definitions and laws which you and your grammarians have laid down. For what is the*

*difference between putting a masculine Three first, and then adding One and One and One in the neuter, or after a masculine One and One and One to use the Three not in the masculine but in the neuter, which you yourselves disclaim in the case of Deity?"*

*"It is clear that Gregory recognized the inconsistency with Greek grammar if all we have are verses six and eight without verse seven. Other scholars have recognized the same thing. This was the argument of Robert Dabney of Union Theological Seminary in his book, *The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek* (1891). Bishop Middleton in his book, *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, argues that verse seven must be a part of the text according to the Greek structure of the passage. Even in the famous commentary by Matthew Henry, there is a note stating that we must have verse seven if we are to have proper Greek in verse eight.*

*"While the external evidence makes the originality of the Comma possible, the internal evidence makes it very probable. When we consider the providential hand of God and His use of the Traditional Text in the Reformation it is clear that the Comma is authentic."*

David Cloud supports 1 John 5:7 as follows<sup>6 Part 3</sup>.

*"WHITE MAKES AN ISSUE OF THE ALLEGED LACK OF SUPPORT FOR 1 JOHN 5:7.*

*"White largely ignores the powerful arguments which have led Bible believers to accept 1 John 5:7 as Scripture for centuries on end. 1 John 5:7 stood unchallenged in the English Bible for a full six hundred years. It was in the first English Bible by John Wycliffe in 1380, in Tyndale's New Testament of 1525, the Coverdale Bible of 1535, the Matthew's Bible of 1537, the Taverner Bible of 1539, the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva New Testament of 1557, the Bishop's Bible of 1568, and the Authorized Version of 1611. It did not disappear from a standard English Bible until the English Revised of 1881 omitted it.*

*"James White would probably reply, "Sure, Wycliffe translated from the Latin Bible and 1 John 5:7 has always been in the Latin Bible. It was an accident of history. It doesn't mean anything." I believe this history means a lot. The fact that the most widely used Bibles through the centuries contained 1 John 5:7 speaks volumes to me. It tells me that God had His hand in this, that it is preserved Scripture. Were the countless preachers, theologians, church and denominational leaders, editors, translators, etc., who accepted the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7-8 of these English Bibles through all these long centuries really so ignorant? What a proud generation we have today! White is correct when he states that long tradition in itself is not proof that something is true, but he ignores the fact that long tradition CAN BE an evidence that something is true, and if that tradition lines up with the Word of God, it is not to be discarded. "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set" (Proverbs 22:28). There are many reasons for believing 1 John 5:7 was penned by the Apostle John under inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but White's readers are not informed of this fact and are left with an insufficient presentation of this issue.*

*"White ignores the scholarly defense of the Trinitarian passage published by Frederick Nolan in 1815 - *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*, in which the Greek manuscripts are newly classed, the integrity of the Authorised Text vindicated, and the various readings traced to their origin. This 576-page volume has been reprinted by Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108. The Southern Presbyterian Review for April 1871, described Nolan's book as "a work which defends the received text with matchless ingenuity and profound learning."*

“White ignores the Christ-honoring scholarship of 19<sup>th</sup>-century Presbyterian scholar Robert Dabney, who wrote in defense of the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7 (*Discussions of Robert Lewis Dabney, “The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek,”* Vol. 1, p. 350-390; Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1891, reprinted 1967). Dabney was offered the editorship of a newspaper at age 22 and it was said of him that no man his age in the U.S. was superior as a writer. He taught at Union Theological Seminary from 1853 to 1883 and pastored the College Church during most of those years. He contributed to a number of publications, including the *Central Presbyterian*, the *Presbyterian Critic*, and the *Southern Presbyterian*. His last years were spent with the Austin School of Theology in Texas, a university he co-founded. A. A. Hodge called Dabney “the best teacher of theology in the United States, if not in the world,” and General Stonewall Jackson referred to him as the most efficient officer he knew (Thomas Cary Johnson, *The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney*, cover jacket, *The Banner of Truth Trust*, 1977 edition of the 1903 original).

“White ignores the fact that it was particularly the Unitarians and German modernists who fought viciously against the Trinitarian passage in the King James Bible. For example, in my library is a copy of Ezra Abbot’s *Memoir of the Controversy Respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7* (New York: James Miller, 1866). Abbot, Harvard University Divinity School professor, was one of at least three Christ-denying Unitarians who worked on the English Revised Version (ERV) of 1881 and the American Standard Version (ASV) of 1901. Abbot was a close friend of Philip Schaff, head of the ASV project, and was spoken of warmly in the introduction to Schaff’s history. According to the testimony of the revisers themselves, the Unitarian Abbot wielded great influence on the translation. Consider the following statement by Matthew Riddle, a member of the ASV translation committee:

““Dr. Ezra Abbot was the foremost textual critic in America, and HIS OPINIONS USUALLY PREVAILED WHEN QUESTIONS OF TEXT WERE DEBATED. Dr. Ezra Abbot presented a very able paper on the last clause of Romans 9:5, arguing that it was a doxology to God, and not to be referred to Christ. His view of the punctuation, which is held by many modern scholars, appears in the margin of the American Appendix, and is more defensible than the margin of the English Company. Acts 20:28. ‘The Lord’ is placed in the text, with this margin: ‘Some ancient authorities, including the two oldest manuscripts, read God.’...Dr. Abbot wrote a long article in favor of the reading [which removes ‘God’ from the text]” (Matthew Riddle, *The Story of the Revised New Testament*, Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Co., 1908, pp. 30,39,83).

“Matthew Riddle’s testimony in this regard is very important as he was one of the most influential members of the American Standard Version committee and one of the few members who survived to see the translation printed. The ASV was the first influential Bible published in America to drop 1 John 5:7 from the text, AND IT DID SO UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF A UNITARIAN. White sees no significance to these matters. I see great significance. White, as do most modern version defenders, ignores the direct Unitarian connection with modern textual criticism and with the textual changes pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ which appear in the modern versions. We have exposed this connection extensively in our book *Modern Versions Founded upon Apostasy*.

“White also ignores the scholarly articles defending 1 John 5:7 which have been published since the late 1800s by the Trinitarian Bible Society. He also ignores the excellent defense of 1 John 5:7-8 by Jack Moorman in his 1988 book *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text: A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version*

(*Bible for Today*, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108). Moorman gives an overview of the internal and external evidence for this important verse. White also ignores the excellent reply given in 1980 by Dr. Thomas Strouse to D. A. Carson's *The King James Version Debate*, in which Dr. Strouse provides an overview of the arguments supporting the authenticity of 1 John 5:7 as it stands in the Received Text. Dr. Strouse (Ph.D. in theology from Bob Jones University) is Chairman of the Department of Theology, Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary (717 N. Whitehurst Landing Rd., Virginia Beach, Virginia 23464. 888-482-2287, [tbcm@exis.net](mailto:tbcm@exis.net)).

“White also ignores the landmark work of Michael Maynard, author of *A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7-8* (Comma Publications, 1855 “A” Ave. #4, Douglas, AZ 85607). It is possible, of course, that he had not seen Maynard's book prior to the publication of *The King James Bible Controversy*. Maynard's book basically summarizes the long-standing defense of 1 John 5:7-8 as it exists in the King James Bible, but White pretends that there is no reasonable defense of the Trinitarian passage.”

Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 115ff</sup> summarises the reasons why bible critics reject 1 John 5:7 and cites Dabney's evaluation of the verse as follows. See also this author's earlier work<sup>8 p 322ff</sup>.

“*The masculine article, numeral and participle HOI TREIS MARTUROUTES, are made to agree directly with three neuters, an insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty. If the disputed words are allowed to remain, they agree with two masculines and one neuter noun HO PATER, HO LOGOS, KAI TO HAGION PNEUMA and, according to the rule of syntax, the masculines among the group control the gender over a neuter connected with them. Then the occurrence of the masculines TREIS MARTUROUTES in verse 8 agreeing with the neuters PNEUMA, HUDOR, and HAIMA may be accounted for by the power of attraction, well known in Greek syntax...If the words [of verse 7] are omitted, the concluding words at the end of verse 8 contain an unintelligible reference. The Greek words KAI HOI TREIS EIS TO HEN EISIN mean precisely - “and these three agree to that (aforesaid) One.” If the 7<sup>th</sup> verse is omitted “that One” does not appear.”*”

Moorman adds that “Gaussen says it best: “Remove it, [verse 7] and the grammar becomes incoherent.””

White may disagree but the sources that Moorman quotes provide much more detailed analyses than White does. As indicated, Moorman also gives a detailed analysis of support for 1 John 5:7 as it reads in the AV1611 – see Holland and Cloud above - and refers the reader to Dr Hills<sup>65 p 209ff</sup> for his explanation of why the verse was possibly omitted from the majority of Greek manuscripts.

Dr Hills refers to Sabellius's heresy of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, which taught that the three Persons of the Godhead were not distinct Persons but identical. Hills concludes that the statement “**these three are one**” in 1 John 5:7 “no doubt seemed to [orthodox Christians] to teach the Sabellian view...and if during the course of the controversy manuscripts were discovered which had lost this reading [by accidental omission], it is easy to see how the orthodox party would consider these mutilated manuscripts to represent the true text and regard the Johannine Comma as a heretical addition.”

Dr Hills states that “In the Greek-speaking East...the struggle against Sabellianism was particularly severe,” resulting in the loss of 1 John 5:7 from most Greek manuscripts, whereas it was nevertheless preserved in the Latin-speaking West “where the influence of Sabellianism was probably not so great.”

White attempts to undermine Dr Hills's analysis of support for 1 John 5:7 as follows<sup>3 p 85</sup>. “Hills is one of the few who seem to have thought through the matter to its conclusion,



*though he is not quick to bring out the fact that this means the Greek manuscript tradition can be so corrupted as to lose, without trace, an entire reading.” White’s contempt for bible believers emerges once again, where he states in this note “Most who defend [1 John 5:7] do so by merely repeating the maxim that the KJV is the Word of God, and hence the passage should be there (i.e. they use completely circular reasoning).”*

Again, White ignores his own ‘circularity,’ evident in his own ‘maxim,’ of rejecting AV1611 readings **“by any means,”** 2 Corinthians 11:3a; apparent lack of manuscript support, alleged recension and conflation in the Byzantine *“text-type,”* Erasmus’s notes, *“a great treasure”* like Codex Aleph (supposedly such) and alleged *“harmonization”* and *“expansions of piety”* etc. His note above could be re-worded as follows.

*“I, James White, who reject 1 John 5:7 do so by merely repeating the maxim that the KJV is not the Word of God wherever I can find something that conflicts with it, and hence the passage should not be there (i.e. I use completely circular reasoning).”*

But White is lying about Dr Hills, who gives a comprehensive summary of early sources for 1 John 5:7, including Cyprian, 250 AD, which White wilfully ignored insofar as he had Dr Hills’s book in front of him. See Dr Holland’s remarks above, in refutation of White’s lie.

Moreover, White was clearly too careless to check out the work of R. L. Dabney<sup>8 p 322</sup> who gives a further explanation of how 1 John 5:7 might initially have been removed from early Greek manuscripts, by means that were *not* accidental. See remarks by Whitney and Wilkinson, under **White’s Introduction**, to the effect that *“those who were corrupting the scriptures, claimed that they were really correcting them”* and Colwell’s statement that *“The first two centuries witnessed the creations of the large number of variations known to scholars today in the manuscripts of the New Testament most variations, I believe, were made deliberately.”*

Dabney states.

*“There are strong probable grounds to conclude, that the text of Scriptures current in the East received a mischievous modification at the hands of the famous Origen. Those who are best acquainted with the history of Christian opinion know best, that Origen was the great corrupter, and the source, or at least earliest channel, of nearly all the speculative errors which plagued the church in after ages...He disbelieved the full inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, holding that the inspired men apprehended and stated many things obscurely...He expressly denied the consubstantial unity of the Persons and the proper incarnation of the Godhead - the very propositions most clearly asserted in the doctrinal various readings we have under review.*

*“The weight of probability is greatly in favour of this theory, viz., THAT THE ANTI-TRINITARIANS, FINDING CERTAIN CODICES IN WHICH THESE DOCTRINAL READINGS HAD BEEN ALREADY LOST THROUGH THE LICENTIOUS CRITICISM OF ORIGEN AND HIS SCHOOL, INDUSTRIOUSLY DIFFUSED THEM, WHILE THEY ALSO DID WHAT THEY DARED TO ADD TO THE OMISSIONS OF SIMILAR READINGS.”*

Concerning the Irish Manuscript 61 that White dismisses as *“highly suspect,”* attention is drawn to Dr Ruckman’s description<sup>8 p 321</sup> of this document.

*“How about that Manuscript 61 at Dublin?”*

*“Well, according to Professor Michaelis (cited in Prof. Armin Panning’s “New Testament Criticism”), Manuscript 61 has four chapters in Mark that possess three coinci-*

*dences with Old Syriac, two of which also agree with the Old Itala: ALL READINGS DIFFER FROM EVERY GREEK MANUSCRIPT EXTANT IN ANY FAMILY. The Old Itala was written long before 200 A.D., and the Old Syriac dates from before 170 (Tatian's Diatessaron).*

*“Manuscript 61 was supposed to have been written between 1519 and 1522; the question becomes us, “FROM WHAT?” Not from Ximenes's Polyglot - his wasn't out yet. Not from Erasmus, for it doesn't match his “Greek” in many places. The literal affinities of Manuscript 61 are with the SYRIAC (Acts 11:26), and that version WAS NOT KNOWN IN EUROPE UNTIL 1552 (Moses Mardin).”*

Dr Ruckman's findings add support for 1 John 5:7 from Tatian and the Old Syriac, 170-180 AD, in harmony with the Old Itala Bibles, whose text dates from 157 AD. Again, hardly “a later addition.”

In opposition to all this, White's ally, D. Kutilek, has an article entitled *A Simple Outline on 1 John 5:7* on his site, [www.kjvonly.org/index.html](http://www.kjvonly.org/index.html).

He declares.

*“An Irish monk deliberately fabricated such a manuscript to meet Erasmus' requirement. This manuscript (no. 61) was copied from an early manuscript which did not contain the words. The page in this manuscript containing the disputed words is on a special paper and has a glossy finish, unlike any other page in the manuscript. On the basis of this **one** 16<sup>th</sup> century deliberately falsified manuscript, Erasmus inserted the disputed words in his 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> editions of the Greek NT, though he protested that he did not believe the words were genuine.”*

“Simple” is the operative word.

- Who was this Irish monk?
- What manuscript did he copy from?
- Who testified about “the disputed words” being “on a special paper” and where is the evidence?
- Why should a forger risk arousing suspicion by use of the “special paper”?
- Even then, how does use of the “special paper” establish unequivocally that the “disputed words” were not in the source manuscript?
- Where is the statement from Erasmus protesting against 1 John 5:7?

It is significant that Kutilek fails to address any of these questions. Unless he does, his assertions with respect to Manuscript 61 must be rejected as spurious.

With incisive comments on much of the above, Dr Ruckman summarises the evidence for 1 John 5:7 as follows with respect to texts and citations<sup>2</sup>, “*If I had debated Flimsy-Jimmy, I would have pulled Which Bible? on him (by David Otis Fuller) and put pages 211 and 212 before the video camera. You see, the King James translators had four Waldensian Bibles on their writing tables in 1611. These Waldensian Bibles had 1 John 5:7-8 in them.*”

See remarks under *Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare*. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Watch God Almighty preserving His words. In spite of the negative, critical, destructive work of “godly Conservative and Evangelical “scholars.” AD 170: Old Syriac and Old*

*Latin, AD 180: Tatian and Old Syriac, AD 200: Tertullian and Old Latin, AD 250: Cyprian and Old Latin, AD 350: Priscillian and Athanasius, AD 415: Council of Carthage, AD 450: Jerome's Vulgate, AD 510: Fulgentius, AD 750: Wianburgensis, AD 1150: Miniscule manuscript 88, AD 1200-1500: Four Waldensian Bibles, AD 1519: Greek Manuscript 61, AD 1520-1611: Erasmus TR, AD 1611: King James Authorized Version of the Holy Bible.*

*"God had to work a miracle to get the truth of 1 John 5:7-8 preserved; He preserved it. You have it; but not in an RV, RSV, NRSV, CEV, ASV, NASV, or NIV."*

See also David Daniels's<sup>43 p 110ff</sup> review of the evidence for 1 John 5:7. He states *"157-1600s AD Waldensian (that is, Vaudois) Bibles have the verse\*. It took [the Roman Catholic religion] until the 1650s to finish their hateful attacks...on the Vaudois and their Bible. But the Vaudois were successful in preserving God's words to the days of the Reformation."* See remarks above and under ***Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare***.

\*This site<sup>75</sup> is also a good summary of the evidence and researcher Kevin James<sup>76 p 230ff</sup> provides a thoroughgoing discussion of 1 John 5:7.

White continues to cast doubt<sup>3 p 63, 66-8</sup> on further AV1611 readings by highlighting alleged lack of manuscript support, variant readings of the Received Text and/or the advances of *"modern scholarship."* His next group of such readings consists of Luke 2:14, Acts 8:37, 9:5, 6, 19:20, Ephesians 1:18, 3:9, 2 Timothy 2:19.

It should be noted that the NIV departs from the AV1611 according to White's preferred readings with the DR, JR, JB, NWT in Luke 2:14, Ephesians 1:18, 3:9 and 2 Timothy 2:19, with the JB, NWT in all the verses apart from Acts 19:20, where it departs with the JB. See ***Appendix, Table A1***. Once again, White shows that he believes that God gave His word to Rome and Watchtower in preference to faithful bible believers down through the centuries.

All the AV1611 readings for these verses will satisfy 6 of Burgon's 7 tests of truth<sup>8 p 43</sup> for authenticating a disputed text. Except for Luke 2:14 in the AV1611, which satisfies all 7, only number of witnesses is lacking, on the basis of the evidence available today and von Soden's limited collation of the cursive manuscripts.

Concerning Luke 2:14, White maintains that *"While maintaining the reading of Erasmus at Luke 2:14, in his text, Beza disputes this in his comments. Modern Greek texts agree with Beza, resulting in the differences between the KJV's "good will toward men" and the NASB's "among men with whom he is pleased.""* The NIV reads similarly to the AV1611, with *"on whom his favour rests."*

The *"Modern Greek texts"* include the corrupted editions<sup>62</sup> of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford and later Nestle's 21<sup>st</sup> Edition. They agree only with Beza's *notes*, not his *text*.

White has a further comment on this verse later in his book that reflects his inclination to the heresy of 5-Point Calvinism<sup>3 p 169-70</sup> – see Whitney's comments on White's Hyper-Calvinism at the start of ***Chapter 2***. White states.

*"This variant involves the difference between the nominative form of the word [for "good will"] and the genitive form ["of good will"]...Dr Metzger notes that there is a possibility that the move from the genitive to the nominative could have taken place by simple oversight...Furthermore, the nominative makes an "easier" reading than the genitive, which speaks of God's peace seen in the birth of the Savior resting on those that God has*

*chosen to be the recipients thereof [i.e. like James White and his Calvinist fellow-travellers]. Edward F. Hills cites Theodore Beza, who, though retaining the nominative reading in his text, felt the genitive was the more likely reading: “Nevertheless, following the authority of Origen, Chrysostom, the Old (Vulgate) translation, and finally the sense itself, I should prefer to read “(men) of good will.” Compare this insight from Beza...with the words of KJV Only advocate Gail Riplinger on the same passage:*

*““The former has the genitive “eudokios,” (sic) [eudokias, “of good will”], while the latter has the nominative, “eudokia” [“good will”]. Watch out for the letter ‘s’ – sin, Satan, Sodom, Saul (had to be changed to Paul). The added ‘s’ here is the hiss of the serpent...In their passion to give space to Satan’s sermon, they follow four corrupt fourth and fifth century MSS while ignoring a total of 53 ancient witnesses including 16 belonging to the second, third and fourth centuries and 37 from the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth centuries.”*

*“The difference between textual criticism done on the basis of facts and evidence, and that done on the basis of conspiracies and prejudgement is plainly evident.”*

White’s concluding statement is truly astounding. Only Riplinger gives *all* the facts and *all* the evidence, *not Beza*. Moreover, White omits salient portions from both citations that he gave. Yet he insinuates, unjustifiably, that Gail Riplinger does precisely this in her evaluation of new version editors. Once again, James White demonstrates his ‘inconsistency’ and ‘double standard.’

Dr Hills concludes<sup>65 p 208</sup> his statement on Beza in part as follows.

*“The diffident manner in which Beza reveals these doubts shows that he was conscious of running counter to the views of his fellow believers [i.e. ordinary bible believers had long accepted the reading “**good will toward men**” as found in the AV1611 – see Dr Mrs Riplinger’s<sup>39 p 932ff</sup> remarks earlier on Erasmus\*]. Just as with Erasmus and Calvin, so also with Beza there was evidently a conflict going on within his mind between his humanistic tendency to treat the New Testament like any other book and the common faith in the current New Testament text. But...God used this common faith providentially to restrain Beza’s humanism and lead him to publish far and wide the true New Testament text.”*

*\*“White...is trying to give his readers the false impression that these men ‘created’ this text, rather than merely PRINTING the Greek text that was received everywhere.”*

Dr Hills reveals that “*the facts and evidence*” show that God preserved His word in spite of Beza’s humanism – “*facts and evidence*” that James White wilfully omitted to mention.

White has taken his citation of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments<sup>14 p 229ff</sup> from Chapter 13 of *New Age Versions*, entitled *Another Gospel*. The chapter addresses the Calvinistic heresy\* of Unconditional Election, supported by the New Age renderings of Luke 2:14 in the NASV, NIV, as indicated together with the DR, JR, JB, NWT and the critical editions of unsaved editors; Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and later Nestle.

\*See *The Other Side of Calvinism*, by Dr Laurence Vance for a complete treatise on this particular heresy, [www.vancepublications.com/](http://www.vancepublications.com/).

The context of the quote that White takes from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s book reads as follows. Emphasis is the author’s.

*“Edwin Palmer...was the “coordinator of all the work on the NIV”...Palmer devoted an entire chapter in his book, *The Five Points of Calvinism*, to disprove the idea that “man*

still has the ability to ask God's help for salvation"...Palmer's chapter on the 'Elect' elite is reflected in [NIV] translation of 1 Thessalonians 1:4, "he has chosen you." He admits his change "suggests the opposite of "the KJV's "your election of God." In his system, God elects a few 'winners.' In Christianity, God calls all sinners, but few elect to respond...Palmer believes," Man is entirely passive." He points to his alteration of John 1:13 asserting that it 'proves' man has no free will.

"[Palmer's] 'elite' were serenaded by the heavenly host in Luke 2:14 in the NIV and NASB. However in the KJV the good will of God was extended to all men, not his favorite 'God-pleasing' elect."

Here Dr Mrs Riplinger inserts the comparative readings for the NASV, NIV, KJV and states "Here, the new versions follow manuscripts Aleph, B, C and D." The extract that White gives then follows. She concludes as follows. "Palmer's Calvinism did not rest with his influence in the NIV. The New King James Committee boasts seven members who subscribe to Palmer's elite 'Elect' and damned 'depraved' classes."

Much of the venom directed at Dr Mrs Riplinger by her critics such as White, Kutilek and others stems from her scriptural stance against the heresy of Five-Point Calvinism. As the prophet Amos warned many centuries ago.

**"They hate him that rebuketh in the gate, and they abhor him that speaketh uprightly"**  
Amos 5:10.

Or her. Especially her.

The evidence in favour of the AV1611 reading "**good will toward men**" is summarised as follows<sup>8 p 68</sup>, reference numbers altered as appropriate.

"The evidence in favour of the AV1611 against the modern textual critics is cited by Burgon<sup>13 p 42-43, 422-423</sup>, by Fuller citing Burgon<sup>77 p 96</sup> and the TBS article Good Will Toward Men. Only five codices; Aleph, A, B, D, W, support the modern textual critics, against "every existing copy of the Gospels, amounting to many hundreds" Fuller, *ibid*.

"Although the Latin, Sahidic and Gothic versions support the modern textual critics, the AV1611 reading is supported by:

2<sup>nd</sup> Century: Syriac versions, Irenaeus

3<sup>rd</sup> Century: Coptic version, Origen, Apostolical Constitutions

4<sup>th</sup> Century: Eusebius, Aphraates the Persian, Titus of Bostra, Didymus, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraem Syrus, Philo, Bishop of Carpasus, Chrysostom

5<sup>th</sup> Century: Armenian version, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Theodotus of Ancyra, Proclus, Paulus of Emesa, Basil of Seleucia, the Eastern bishops of Ephesus collectively

6<sup>th</sup> Century: Georgian and Ethiopic versions, Cosmos, Anastasius Sinaita, Eulogius, Archbishop of Alexandria

7<sup>th</sup> Century: Andreas of Crete

8<sup>th</sup> Century: Cosmos, Bishop of Maiuma, John Damascene, Germanus, Archbishop of Constantinople, Pope Martinus."

Further insight into White's speculation on Luke 2:14 emerges from this article by T. L. Hubert<sup>78</sup>. Emphases are the author's.

*“James White, in trying to bolster this reading, cites a fact from Edward F. Hills: that Theodore Beza, whose Textus Receptus edition the KJV translators followed, retained eudokia in his text but noted that he believed eudokias was correct (King James Only Controversy, p. 170). Given Beza’s Calvinistic beliefs, we would expect him to be favorable to a reading that seemed to reflect Calvin’s doctrine of predestination. But even Paul, who said more that could be taken in support of predestination than any other apostle (e.g., Rom. 8:28-30), acknowledged that Christ “died for all” - 2 Cor. 5:14-15 - and that God used this as a way “to reconcile all things unto himself” - Col. 1:20. And John is similarly expansive in a well-known passage of scripture - John 3:16-17 - which claims that God gave His Son “that the world [not just certain elect individuals] through him might be saved.”*

*“On balance, then, it seems more likely that the passage in this gospel of Luke would extend “good will” to all, rather than reflecting a restriction on the gift of Christ to those “in whom he is well pleased” which accords with the hyper-predestination of some theologies.”*

Tom Hubeart has a site<sup>79</sup> entitled *The NIV-Only Controversy*, a parody on *The King James Only Controversy*, which contains a link to James White’s response to Dr Holland’s critique<sup>4</sup> of White’s book. White vehemently denounces Dr Holland’s critique but immediately begins to contradict himself and misrepresent his critic. He quotes Dr Holland ““White seeks to justify the use of modern versions such as the NIV and NASV while attacking those who hold to the Authorized Version as the word of God”” and then states, “A fair reading of my book shows that I have no desire to “attack” those who hold to the AV as the Word of God. In fact, I said it **is** the Word of God, just as the NASB or NIV is rightly called “the Word of God.” I did not “attack” anyone” (author’s emphasis).

“A fair reading” of White’s book shows that he blames<sup>3 p v</sup> “the KJV Only camp for the destruction of many Christian churches.” White’s accusation, which remains unsubstantiated throughout his book, is a blatant attack on bible believers, regardless of his insistence to the contrary. Moreover, Dr Holland referred to “the Authorized Version as the word of God,” that is, the scripture, John 10:35, not “Word of God.” This term appears only once in scripture, with reference to the Lord Jesus Christ as “**The Word of God**,” Revelation 19:13. White’s application of the phrase is therefore unclear, especially insofar as he obviously regards certain passages in the AV1611 as the words of men, e.g. Acts 8:37, 1 John 5:7, alleged<sup>3 p 37, 43, 47, 177</sup> “harmonization,” e.g. with respect to Colossian 1:2 in the AV1611, “expansion of piety,” and “balancing” acts, e.g. with respect to Romans 11:6, 14:6 in the AV1611. He also regards some passages in the NIV as “too interpretive for my tastes” and even his preferred NASV<sup>3 p 26</sup> “utilize(s) less-than-literal renderings at times when...not actually forced to do so by the text itself.”

In other words, even these modern ‘improvements’ on the AV1611 are, in White’s opinion, tainted by the words of men. He insists that the translators “felt justified in their work” – no doubt just like Eve did, in taking the forbidden fruit, Genesis 3:6 – but given the apparent influence of men in the compilation of the NASV, NIV, how can White truly describe these versions as “the Word of God,” however he perceives that term? White doesn’t explain.

Nevertheless, he maintains<sup>3 p 94-5</sup> that we “are to make learning and studying God’s Word a high priority in our lives” and “to be lovers of the truth” holding “to the highest standards thereof,” but, unfortunately, in so doing we can have no certainty\* of finding out precisely what God said or where it is documented because, according to James White, “Those who offer absolute certainty do so at a cost: individual responsibility.” So how is

the child of God meant to exercise “*individual responsibility*” in order to acquire “*God’s Word*” for the purpose of “*learning and studying*”? White does not explain. He simply implies that it is individuals *like himself* who are most suited to recovering the ‘true’ scriptures, on behalf of the rest of the Body of Christ.

See remarks under *Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath*.

\*Even though Solomon said we did, “*Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, That I might make thee know the certainty of the words of truth; that thou mightest answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee?*” Proverbs 22:20, 21.

Understanding White’s perception of “*the Word of God*” or “*God’s Word*” is rendered even more difficult because his first usage of the term “*God’s Word*” is in a derogatory sense, where he states<sup>3 p v</sup> that “*Anyone who would seek to reason with [the KJV Only movement] runs the risk of being identified as an “enemy of God’s Word,” i.e. the KJV,*” i.e. the KJV is “*God’s Word*” only in the prejudiced imaginations of the destructive, church-splitting KJV Only lobby, according to James White.

His first actual reference<sup>3 p iv</sup> to the AV1611 is neither as “*the Word of God*” nor “*God’s Word*” but as “*a seventeenth-century Anglican translation of the Bible,*” “*Bible*” unspecified, as indicated earlier – see *White’s Introduction*. Even in his response to Dr Holland, White subsequently refers<sup>3 p vii</sup> to the AV1611 as “*a great, yet imperfect, translation of the Bible,*” (“*Bible*” still unspecified) as he insists on “*a little context!*” for his remarks. At the end of White’s polemic against Dr Holland, the reader is none the wiser about specifically what “*the Word of God*” is according to James White and why he blatantly contradicted himself in applying to the term to books that in his opinion are undoubtedly in part demonstrably not even the *words* of God but the words of men.

Where Dr Holland raises the question, “*Has White been speaking with Erasmus lately?*” White responds indignantly, his emphases, “*No, but I sure have been reading him, and I said what I did on the basis of what Erasmus wrote. Holland conveniently ignores the preceding six pages of information, replete with twenty-two endnotes almost all of which are from Erasmus’ own writings in making this statement. This isn’t reviewing a book, this is massacring a book.*”

White’s “*six pages of information*” consist of extracts from Erasmus’s arguments with Martin Dorp over the Latin Vulgate and Erasmus’s conjectures about a handful of readings now found in the AV1611, including Matthew 1:18, 20:22, Romans 10:17, 12:11, 1 Timothy 3:16, all being reviewed in this chapter, where Erasmus speculated about ‘scribal additions’ and “*harmonization*” but included most of the future AV1611 readings in his text. Mere ‘guesswork,’ according to White but which prompted Dr Mrs Riplinger to observe that “*critics, such as James White<sup>3 p 58-9</sup>, feel that, “Erasmus guessed” or “Erasmus’ hunch” led him to the readings which match almost every Greek manuscript known today... Without the preservation of the text by God, try guessing all of them for yourself...*” See comments at the beginning of this chapter.

In sum, White’s diatribe against Dr Holland is reminiscent of the old adage, ‘A hit dog yells...’

Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>7 Part 5</sup> further with respect to White and Luke 2:14, author’s emphases.

“*KJV antagonists love to quote White’s remarks about my brief comments about the letter “S”. I stated:*

*“Their Greek differs from the overwhelming majority of manuscripts by one letter, ‘s’. The former has the genitive eudokios [eudokias] while the latter has the nominative eudokia. Watch out for the letter “s” - sin, Satan, Sodom, Saul (had to be changed to Paul). The added ‘s’ here [emphasis added] is the hiss of the serpent.”*

*“The new versions destroy the meaning of Luke 2:14 because of an added ‘s’ in their minority Greek text. My comments about the ‘s’ were intended as satire and fit Webster’s definition:*

*““trenchant wit, irony or sarcasm, used for the purpose of exposing or discrediting vice or folly”*

*“That was the intent. HOWEVER, White is wrong to assume that the comment is devoid of truth. The realities regarding the letter ‘s’ are known to any student of linguistics. A brief history follows, if only to prove that: 1.) even simple statements in New Age Bible Versions were not made without years of study behind them. 2.) Mr. White’s background in most of the subjects under discussion is shallow, at best.” See site for the aforementioned history, of which an extract follows.*

*“Every dictionary and reference book (look up ‘s’ in Webster’s) calls ‘s’ “the hissing sound.” The sound phonetically associated with the serpent shaped pictograph was the sound made by the serpent-hiss. (pronounce ‘s’ as “hiss”) Even Webster’s “Guide to Pronunciation” identifies ‘s’ “as in hiss,” on p. vii. ‘S’ is the hissing sound in French, German, and most other European languages.”*

Dr Moorman gives detailed citations<sup>9 p 86</sup> of the sources in favour of the AV1611 reading **“goodwill toward men”** versus the handful in opposition. The sources in support of the AV1611 include the second and third correctors of Aleph and B respectively, indicating that agreement over the rendering was not uniform even amongst the preservers of what White regards<sup>3 p 33</sup> as “a great treasure,” (Aleph) and “another great codex,” (B).

An insightful comment on the AV1611 reading **“goodwill toward men”** emerges from the pen of the late General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley<sup>80 p 259-60, 1924-2006</sup><sup>81</sup>. In 1950, General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley was a captain and adjutant in the Gloucestershire Regiment, when it was surrounded and taken prisoner by the Communist Chinese after sustaining heavy casualties at the battle of the Imjin River during the Korean War.

General Farrar-Hockley spent two and a half years as a prisoner-of-war and made these observations about a special ‘Christmas’ message delivered to the Allied POWs by a representative of Camp Commandant Ding named Chang on Christmas Day, 1952.

*“He began to read from a page of typescript in his hand...It was in the worst possible taste; for after starting mildly, Ding [the camp commandant] had been unable to restrain his fanaticism for the Communist cause. He quoted – or rather, misquoted – the Scriptures, particularly the teachings of Christ. We heard the beloved Christmas words, for instance, rendered as follows: “Peace on earth to men of good will”; and the only men of good will, it seemed, were those who followed the policies of the Cominform group of governments. As Chang read on, the silence seemed to intensify. When he had finished, no one spoke; but I have neither felt nor seen before such profound disgust expressed silently by a body of men.”*

White’s ‘preferred reading’ in Luke 2:14 is the same as Commandant Ding’s, with slight variation (Calvinists might have to compete with CommUNists for favoured-species status). Little more need be said, except that, providentially, bible believers do not have to remain silent about their profound disgust with White’s ‘preference.’



White says with respect to Acts 8:37 ***“And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God”*** that *“the verse is found in only a very few Greek manuscripts, none earlier than the sixth century, and Erasmus inserted it due to its presence in the Vulgate... While the insertion surely speaks the truth... We cannot “improve” upon what God has revealed.”*

He has a note on the verse stating *“Some have suggested (Hills, p. 201) that this passage was original, but was deleted due to later ecclesiastical practices regarding baptism. The fact, however, that it is found in the Latin Vulgate, which certainly shows as much, if not more, evidence of ecclesiastical “concern” makes this argument somewhat tenuous.”*

Evidence in support of Acts 8:37 has been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 77-8, 326-8</sup>. Dr Holland<sup>55 p 157-8</sup> states with respect to Acts 8:37.

*““And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.”*

*“Here the testimony of this faithful and beloved African, the Ethiopian eunuch, does not appear in the Critical Text. Some have argued that the verse is not genuine because it is found in only a few late manuscripts and was inserted into the Greek text by Erasmus from the Latin Vulgate. It is true that the passage appears in the Latin Vulgate of Jerome. However, the passage also appears in a vast number of other Old Latin manuscripts (such as l, m, e, r, ar, ph, and gig). It also is found in the Greek Codex E (eighth century) and several Greek manuscripts (36, 88, 97, 103, 104, 242, 257, 307, 322, 323, 385, 429, 453, 464, 467, 610, 629, 630, 913, 945, 1522, 1678, 1739, 1765, 1877, 1891, and others). While there are differences even among these texts as to precise wording, the essence of the testimony still remains where it has been removed from other manuscripts. Additionally, Irenaeus (202 AD), Cyprian (258 AD), Ambrosiaster (fourth century), Pacian (392 AD), Ambrose (397 AD), Augustine (430 AD), and Theophylact (1077 AD) all cite Acts 8:37.*

*“If the text were genuine, why would any scribe wish to delete it? In his commentary on the book of Acts, Dr. J. A. Alexander provides a possible answer. By the end of the third century it had become common practice to delay the baptism of Christian converts to assure that they had truly understood their commitment to Christ and were not holding to one of the various heretical beliefs prevalent at that time. It is possible that a scribe, believing that baptism should not immediately follow conversion, omitted this passage from the text, which would explain its absence in many of the Greek manuscripts that followed. Certainly this conjecture is as possible as the various explanations offered by those who reject the reading.”*

This is the explanation that Dr Hills gave to which White referred – see above. White was careful not to give any of the details that Drs Hills and Holland included, because Rome does *not* delay baptism. She sprinkles infants. Jerome would therefore have no reason to excise Acts 8:37 from the Vulgate – the sooner the baptism the better. It is therefore White’s objection that is tenuous, not the explanation to which Dr Hills refers. Dr Holland continues.

*“Nevertheless, because of biblical preservation, the reading remains in some Greek manuscripts as well as in the Old Latin manuscripts. Clearly the reading is far more ancient than the sixth century, as some scholars have suggested [and James White]. Irenaeus noted that “the believing eunuch himself:...immediately requesting to be baptized, he said, ‘I believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God’.” Likewise, Cyprian quotes the first half of the verse in writing, “In the Acts of the Apostles: ‘Lo, here is water; what*

*is there which hinders me from being baptized? Then said Philip, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest’.*” These statements, clearly quotations of Acts 8:37, appear by the end of the second century and at the first half of the third. We see that the passage was in common use long before the existing Greek manuscripts were ever copied. This in itself testifies to its authenticity and to the assurance of biblical preservation.”

Moorman<sup>11 p 60-1</sup> notes that the verse is found in Tyndale’s, the Great, Geneva and Bishops’ Bibles and the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever, in addition to the sources that Holland cites above, which include at least 30 Greek manuscripts, hardly “a very few” as White tries to maintain.

The editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth join with White in omitting the verse<sup>62</sup>. Birds of a feather...

Concerning Acts 9:5, 6, 19:20, White insists that “Erasmus indicated that the Vulgate and the parallel passage in Acts 26 caused him to insert the phrase “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks” at Acts 9:5 as well, again placing the TR in direct conflict with the vast majority of Greek manuscripts. The Vulgate is also the source of a large section of Acts 9:6, “And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him...” as well as the reading “the word of God” at Acts 19:20 rather than the reading of the Greek texts, “the word of the Lord.””

Dr Holland responds<sup>55 p 158-61</sup> as follows on Acts 9:5, 6. Evidence in support of the AV1611 reading is summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 78</sup>.

“Acts 9:5-6 - “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks”

“And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.”

“The phrase from verse five, “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,” is in the Old Latin and some Vulgate manuscripts. It is also in the Peshitta and the Greek of Codex E and 431, but in verse four instead of verse five. The passage from verse six that reads, “And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him” is in the Old Latin, the Latin Vulgate, and some of the Old Syrian and Coptic versions. These phrases, however, are not found in the vast majority of Greek manuscripts and therefore do not appear in either the Critical Text or the Majority Text. Yet, they are included in the Textus Receptus. On the surface the textual evidence looks weak. Why, then, should the Textus Receptus be accepted over the majority of Greek witnesses at this point? Because the phrases are preserved in other languages, and the internal evidence establishes that Christ in fact spoke these words at the time of Paul’s conversion and are therefore authentic.

“Acts chapter nine is not the only place in Scripture where the conversion of Paul is established. In Acts 22:10 and 26:14 we have the testimony of the Apostle himself. There, in all Greek texts, the phrases in question appear.

“Acts 22:10 - “And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.”

“Acts 26:14 - “And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.”

*“When the apostle Paul recounts his conversion he cites the words in question. It is certain that the Holy Spirit inspired these words which should be included at Acts 9:5-6. We must conclude that these words were spoken when the event originally occurred. Although they have not been preserved in the Greek manuscripts at Acts 9:6, they have been preserved in the Latin manuscripts (ar, c, h, l, p, ph, t) as well as other translations (Georgian, Slavonic, Ethiopic). The greatest textual critic of all, the Holy Spirit, bears witness to their authenticity by including them in Acts 22:10 and 26:14.*

*“A similar example may be noted in Matthew 19:17, although the textual evidence is much stronger there. The King James Version reads, “And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” Modern texts render “why callest thou me good” to “why do you ask me about what is good.” Also, the reply of Christ, “there is none good but one, that is, God” is rendered “there is only one who is good.”*

*“This verse, as it stands in the King James, wonderfully establishes the deity of Jesus Christ. If only God is good and Christ is called good, He must be God. The Greek support for the reading of the KJV, as presented in the Traditional Text, is substantial. Among the uncials it is found in C and W (fifth century), K and D (ninth century) and a few others. It is the reading of the majority of Greek cursives and lectionaries. It is also the reading of the Old Latin, the Old Syriac, the Coptic, and other early translations. The textual evidence is much stronger than that of Acts 9:5-6. Similarly, this passage has additional references to determine what the original reading must be. Again the Holy Spirit comes to the aid of this textual problem by providing for us two other places where this event is cited. In both cases there is no textual variant in the places supporting the disputed passage.*

*“Mark 10:18. “And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.”*

*“Luke 18:19. “And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God.”*

*“In neither passage does the Lord say anything like, “Why do you ask me about what is good?” And, in both passages we find the noun “God.” Therefore, we do not have to ask ourselves which reading in Matthew 19:17 is correct because the Holy Spirit has made it clear in additional passages which one is the correct reading. The same principle may be applied to Acts 9:5-6. Once again God bears testimony to His word.”*

Will Kinney<sup>82</sup>, citing Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 61</sup>, has the following comments about Acts 9:5, 6.

*“Regarding the second longer part of this verse, according to Jack Moorman’s book “When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text, all these words are found in the Textus Receptus, the Old Latin translation dating from 150 AD (ar, c, h, l, p, ph, t), the Clementine Vulgate, one Arabic version, the Ethiopic version, Armenian, Slavonic, and the ancient Georgian version of the 5th century. It is also quoted by the church Fathers of Hilary 367, Ambrose 397, Ephraem 373, and Lucifer in 370.*

*“...The Greek manuscripts of the uncial E and the cursive of 431 contain all these words as found in the KJB but they are placed at the end of verse 4 instead of in verse 6, and so read the Syriac Peshitta translations of Lamsa 1936 and James Murdock 1858.*

*“The verses stand as they are in the King James Bible, Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible, Bishops’ Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599...*

*“The Greek text of Stephanus in 1550 as well as the Spanish Sagradas Escrituras Versión Antigua of 1569 both read exactly as the text of the King James Bible. These men obviously had access in their day to underlying Greek texts which we no longer possess. Stephanus amassed a good number of manuscripts to compile his Greek edition. He makes reference to Greek manuscripts that we no longer possess today. Here are the readings of these two sources which existed many years before the KJB 1611.*

*“Acts 9:5: eipen de tis ei kurie o de kurios eipen egw eimi ihsous on su diwkeis sklhron soi pros kentra laktizein*

*“Acts 9:6: tremwn te kai qambwn eipen kurie ti me qeleis poihsai kai o kurios pros auton anasthq̄i kai eiselqe eis thn polin kai lalhqhsetai soi ti se dei poiein (Stephanus - 1550)*

*“Acts 9:5: Y él dijo: ¿Quién eres, Señor? Y él Señor dijo: Yo Soy Jesus el Nazareno a quien tú persigues; dura cosa te es dar coces contra el aguijón.*

*“Acts 9:6: El, temblando y temeroso, dijo: ¿Señor, qué quieres que haga? Y el Señor le dice : Levántate y entra en la ciudad, y se te dirá lo que te conviene hacer. Las Sagradas Escrituras Versión Antigua 1569.*

*“Acts 9:5-6 as they stand in the KJB is found in the following Greek texts.*

*“Erasmus 1516 Stephanus 1550 Theodore Beza 1598 Elzevir 1633 Greek N.T. 1894 (available on the internet) Trinitarian Bible Society N.T. George Ricker Berry's Greek text 1981 J.P Green's Greek interlinear 1976 The Modern Greek N.T. 1954 Modern Greek (available on the internet)*

*“It is false to make the assumption that the long phrase found in Acts 9:5-6 was brought directly over from Acts 26:14-16, because the order of events and words recorded there differ from the account given in Acts 9. Three times Paul relates his conversion experience in the book of Acts, and all three are somewhat different - adding to one account what he leaves out in another. They are found in Acts 9:3-9; Acts 22:6-11, and Acts 26:13-18.*

*“In both Acts 9 and Acts 26, the Alexandrian texts differ somewhat from the Textus Receptus, but even following the Greek texts of the TR we can see that the words found in Acts 9 were not taken directly from Acts 26...*

*“...In the Acts 26 account Jesus first tells Paul Who He is and that it is hard for Paul to kick against the pricks, and then Paul asks who it is that is speaking to him. Of great importance is the fact that none of these debated words which are omitted in the NASB, NIV, RSV – “And he trembling and astonished said, Lord what wilt thou have me to do?” - are found there in Acts 26. To assert that they were taken from Acts 26\* and placed in Acts 9 is obviously false, because they do not appear in any texts in Acts 26.*

*“In summary, the words in question by many modern versionists are found among a cluster of divergent readings (as is very often the case). They are found in a few remaining Greek manuscripts, many compiled Greek texts (Ten listed), several ancient versions (the Old Latin existed long before Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were penned), quoted by several early church fathers, and are found in many different Bible translations, both old and new, throughout the entire world, including the Modern Greek version used in all Greek Orthodox churches today.”*

*\*Dr Hills states<sup>8 p 137</sup> that Erasmus took the words “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks” from Acts 26:14 but this statement does not conflict with Kinney’s above. Again,*

the editions<sup>62</sup> of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth, along with Nestle, agree with White in omitting the portions of Acts 9:5, 6 cited above.

With respect to Acts 19:20, Kutilek<sup>83</sup> provides a useful overview. Kutilek, of course, is not a bible believer – see Kinney’s remarks above on Revelation 22:19 - and in the following extract conveys the distinct impression, “*At last! I found a mistake in the KJV!*” so his negative conclusions with respect to the reading “**word of God**” should not be surprising. The emphases are Kutilek’s.

*“In Acts 19:20, the Textus Receptus editions individually and collectively read “ho logos tou kuriou,” that is “the word of the Lord.” F. H. A. Scrivener, in his The New Testament in Greek According to the Text Adopted in the Authorized Version (Cambridge: University Press, 1881) provides indispensable assistance at this point. Scrivener’s work was a reconstruction of the presumptive Greek text followed by the KJV translators (which had never before been put in print). Scrivener made a meticulous examination of printed Greek texts extant as of 1611: the Complutensian Polyglot Greek text (1514), all 5 editions by Erasmus (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1534), the texts of Aldus (1518), Colinaeus (1534), the four Stephanus editions (1546, 1549, 1550, 1551), the Antwerp Polyglot Greek (1572), and all five of Beza’s editions (1560, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598)...*

*“Scrivener’s labors led him to conclude that the 1598 Beza edition (5<sup>th</sup>) of the Greek NT was that most closely followed by the KJV men. However, Scrivener located some 250 places in the NT where that Greek text was not followed. In 190 of these, the reading of one of the other Textus Receptus editions was apparently followed. In an appendix, Scrivener notes the precise locations and editions where the KJV departs from Beza’s 1598 for some other TR edition (pp. 648-655). Acts 19:20 is **not** one of the places listed since all TR editions agreed in reading “the word of the Lord” like the Beza 1598 edition. That is established fact.*

*“However, in an additional list, Scrivener gives 60 readings where the KJV followed NO printed Greek text available to them, and therefore departed from all TR editions. The KJV’s preferred authority in these places? The Latin Vulgate! And among these 60 non-TR readings is Acts 19:20, for here, the KJV, **against all TR editions**, presupposes a Greek reading “ho logos tou theou,” that is, “the word of God”...*

*“The reading “the word of the Lord” found in all TR editions is also the reading of the great majority of extant Greek manuscripts...and as a consequence it is the reading in The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text, edited by Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad (Nelson, 1985, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Likewise reads The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform, edited by Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont (Chilton Book Publishing, 2005). Further, all the prominent textual critics of the 19<sup>th</sup> century agree that the Textus Receptus reading here is right – Griesbach, Scholz, Lachman, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth and even Westcott and Hort. So agree 20<sup>th</sup> century text-editors as well – Nestle, Aland, the UBS committees, et al.*

*“The evidence supporting the Latin Vulgate reading adopted by the KJV at Acts 19:20 is exceedingly thin – reading “word of God” are Greek manuscripts E (which has a parallel Latin text; 6<sup>th</sup> century AD), 88 (12<sup>th</sup>), and 436 (11<sup>th</sup>). These alone are cited in the UBS Greek NT editions 2-4 (recent Nestle editions do not address the variant). Alford’s 19<sup>th</sup> century The Greek Testament (vol. II, p. 215) mentions also manuscripts 21 (13<sup>th</sup>), 73 (11<sup>th</sup>), and 106-2 (11<sup>th</sup>)...the Greek evidence in support is meager.*

*“There is some small support for the minority Greek in the ancient versions (but none from the fathers). As stated, the Vulgate reading is “God” (though some manuscripts,*

notably *Amiatinus*, often considered the best, read “Lord”). [It is worth noting here that *Erasmus*, who often altered his Greek text to conform it to the Latin Vulgate, did **not** do so at Acts 19:20.]

“Likewise most of the “Old Latin” manuscripts read “God”: ar (9<sup>th</sup>); c (12<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup>); e (6<sup>th</sup>); gig (13<sup>th</sup>); and p (13<sup>th</sup>), ph (12<sup>th</sup>), ro (10<sup>th</sup>), and w (14<sup>th</sup>/15<sup>th</sup>). It is almost certain that some at least of these are not pure “Old Latin” manuscripts, but mixtures of Old Latin and Vulgate readings. (Manuscript D [6<sup>th</sup> century], its parallel Old Latin version “d”, as well as the Peshitta Syriac (5<sup>th</sup>) read “he pistis tou theou,” i.e., “the faith of God,” so in a sense, they also support the reading “God,” while abandoning the reading “the word.”)

“...it is an unalloyed fact: the *Textus Receptus*, **in all its editions**, reads “the word of the Lord [this is correct<sup>62</sup>].” Yet, the KJV, following the Latin instead of the Greek, reads “the word of God.”

“But, some will object – “the KJV wasn’t the first or the only English version to abandon the Greek for the Latin here.” Indeed, that assertion is correct. Wycliffe’s version, made from the Vulgate, naturally reads “God” with the Vulgate. But so too did Tyndale (in all three editions) and the Great Bible (1539), the Geneva (1557, 1560), the Bishops’ (1568) and the Rheims (1582 – made from the Vulgate). Indeed, I could find no English translation before the KJV that read “Lord” instead of “God.” Yet, that does not acquit the KJV translators. As translators, they were to work from the original language texts, and to revise previous versions on the basis of the Greek. The very **first** rule given to them by the King was: “The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the **Bishops Bible**, to be followed, and as little altered as the Truth of the original will permit.” The standard, then, was the “truth of the original,” not previous English versions of whatever sort. The translators were under solemn obligation to revise any places where the Bishops Bible did not conform to the truth of the original, and here, indeed, they **failed in their duty.**”

Several observations can be made from the above.

- The “Majority Text,” so-called, is not the ‘Majority Text.’ And it is not necessarily equivalent to “the original language texts” available to the King James translators. It is von Soden’s collation of less than 10% of the available manuscripts, with a leaning towards Alexandrian readings. See White’s comments on “textual variants” in the previous chapter.
- The “prominent textual critics of the 19<sup>th</sup> century” listed were mostly unregenerate and therefore untrustworthy in their departures from the AV1611. See remarks under **Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness.**
- The “exceedingly thin” and “meager (sic)” manuscript support for the AV1611 reading “**word of God**” is at least comparable to that for many departures from the AV1611 found in modern versions such as the NIV that would be supported by the “prominent textual critics of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.” See Moorman<sup>9</sup> p 61ff and Kinney’s remarks above on Revelation 1:6.
- “Mixtures of Old Latin and Vulgate readings” are the result of deliberate corruption, either by Origen, Jerome, or both in turn<sup>33 p 85, 98, 39 p 963</sup>, away from readings that match the AV1611. See Dr Ruckman’s and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks above concerning corruption of the Old Itala bibles. Their disclosures in this respect are important because Kutilek attempts to discredit<sup>84</sup> both Wilkinson’s researches and the agreement between the Old Itala bibles and the AV1611 on his

site. See supplementary chapter in this work, entitled *The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles* and remarks in *Chapter 3* on alleged ‘text types’ where Dr Moorman’s findings indicate that the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions agree in ratio 2:1 and 3:1 respectively for the AV1611 versus the NIV with respect to the 356 doctrinal passages that Moorman addresses – passages that are most likely to draw the attention of potential corrupters of scripture, 2 Corinthians 2:17. The following sites are helpful with respect to refuting Kutilek’s attacks on the AV1611, its supporters and its sources<sup>85, 86</sup>.

- “*The Peshitta Syriac*” is not “(5<sup>th</sup>)” century. Its text is that of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century<sup>8 p 5, 33 p 61, 68, 65 p 172-4</sup>. The progenitor of the theory that the Peshitta originated in the 5<sup>th</sup> century was F. C. Burkitt, *an unsaved liberal*.

So Kutilek is not so trustworthy himself. Concerning his charge that the King James translators “*failed in their duty*” by not following the majority of Greek manuscripts in Acts 19:20 and thereby not conforming “*to the truth of the original*,” which is not the same as the majority of extant manuscripts, surely begs further questions.

Why do “*Men like Mr. Kutilek have no inspired, complete, inerrant Bible*”? See Kinney’s remarks above on Revelation 22:19. Kutilek purports to have access to “*the Majority Text*.” (The fact that it is von Soden’s ‘minority-majority’ does not seem to have perturbed Mr Kutilek.) Surely *he* can use it (along with the minority Critical Text of Nestle-Aland-UBS as necessary) to arrive at an “*inspired, complete, inerrant Bible*” conforming “*to the truth of the original*” even if, in Kutilek’s opinion, the King James translators did not.

Why has he not done so? The absence of such a document implies that it is really Mr Kutilek who has ‘failed in his duty.’

In fact, the King James translators did not fail in theirs, with respect to the context of Acts 19:10-20. In Acts 19:10, the expression “*the word of the Lord Jesus*” is found. Matched with the expression “*word of God*” found in Acts 19:20, emphases added, “*comparing spiritual things with spiritual*” 1 Corinthians 2:13 and John 6:63, provides further biblical testimony to the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ is God. The reading “*the word of the Lord*” fails to provide this explicit testimony and the AV1611 reading is therefore superior.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger explains<sup>39 p 953-5</sup> with respect to Acts 19:20, “*The KJV reading “word of God” is based on a long history of ancient manuscripts and vernacular editions. Extant Greek manuscripts from as early as the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries, which representing much earlier texts, have the word “God” in this verse (e.g. D, E). The most ancient versions use the word “God” (e.g. Old Itala, it<sup>d</sup>, it<sup>w</sup> fourth century; syr<sup>p</sup> fifth century\*, the Armenian Bible, written in the 300s by Chrysostom et al.)...Acts 19:10 introduces the deity of Christ with the phrase; “word of the Lord Jesus”...Acts 19:20 culminates returning to the use of the phrase “word of God,” thereby showing that Jesus is not only the “Lord,” but he is also “God.” The study of a verse’s context and theological import will always determine the correct reading, when a question arises.*”

\*Dr Mrs Riplinger notes elsewhere<sup>14 p 488</sup> that “*the Peshitta Syriac [is] now dated much earlier than the fifth century.*” Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 33-4</sup>, Dr Ruckman<sup>33 p 61, 67, 69, 85</sup> and Dr Holland<sup>55 p 49-51</sup> each give further details on the early date for the Peshitta Syriac Version – see above - Dr Ruckman noting that the 5<sup>th</sup> century Bishop Rabulla of Edessa corrupted Old Syriac manuscripts.

Dr Vance<sup>63 p 25-7</sup> lists the 15 rules issued to the King James translators. Note that while he insists that the King James translators must abide by ‘the rules,’ Kutilek chooses to be more flexible.

He indicates in his article above that “*the truth of the original*” must invariably reside with “*the Majority Text*” but he is quite sanguine about departing from this rule when it suits him.

Reviewing the book entitled *King James Only? A Guide to Bible Translations* by Dr Robert A. Joyner, available in Kutilek’s bookstore, Kutilek states<sup>87</sup> that “*In chapter 4, Dr. Joyner shows the King James only view is not the historic fundamental view. Chapter 5 shows why we can be sure our English translations are accurate. The author then shows why the background for the NIV and the NASB is far superior to the KJV*” (this author’s emphasis).

Many references cited in this work<sup>1, 8, 9, 18, 19, 20, 33, 39, 43</sup> etc show that “*the background for the NIV and the NASB*” is not “*the [perceived] Majority Text.*” Even James White<sup>3 p 43ff</sup> is forced to acknowledge this “*unalloyed fact.*”

It is a second “*unalloyed fact*” that Kutilek and his cronies will not hesitate to ‘prefer’ the (actual) minority text over “*the [perceived] Majority Text*” if, in their ‘scholarly’ opinion, the former is closer “*to the truth of the original.*”

So if they can exercise this liberty (and they do), why couldn’t the King James translators? For Kutilek to insist otherwise (as he does) is both ‘inconsistent’ and indicative of ‘a double standard.’

White states with respect to Ephesians 1:18, “*The TR stands against all other texts in reading “the eyes of your understanding” over against “the eyes of your heart”*” and of Ephesians 3:9 that “*[the TR] likewise is alone...in reading “the fellowship of this mystery” over against the witness of the Greek manuscripts that reads “the administration of the mystery.”*” He adds, his emphases, that “*the TR reading “Let everyone that nameth the name of **Christ** depart from iniquity” [AV1611] at 2 Timothy 2:19 is found in all of one uncial text and one miniscule text over against all other Greek texts that read, “Let everyone who names the name of **the Lord** abstain from wickedness.”*”

White has further comments<sup>3 p 179-80</sup> on Ephesians 3:9, in which he launches another attack on Gail Riplinger.

“*We have already noted the fact that the TR has a very unusual reading of “fellowship,”... We then note the more accurate rendering of the NASB, “ages,” over against the KJV’s “world.” Finally the modern versions do not contain the phrase “by Jesus Christ”... Regarding this final variant, we quote Dr Metzger’s comments: “The Textus Receptus, following...many miniscules adds [“by Jesus Christ”]. Since there is no reason why, if the words were original, they should have been omitted, the [NASB] Committee preferred to read simply [without them], which is decisively supported by P46 Aleph A B C D\* F G P 33 1319 1611 2127 and most versions and early patristic quotations.”*”

“*Yet... Gail Riplinger... writes<sup>14 p 456</sup>, The Greek Textus Receptus has the word for “fellowship,” while other Greek texts use a word which could easily be translated as such. The words “by Jesus Christ” are in the majority of Greek manuscripts and are out in only a few Egyptian manuscripts. Ephesians 3:9 is a microcosm of the new versions. They have: (1) no comforting fellowship, (2) a New Age world that has no beginning, but is cyclical and (3) no Jesus Christ.*”



*“We note that: (1) Riplinger...fails to acknowledge...that the TR’s reading of “fellowship” is pitted against 99.5% of all the Greek manuscripts; (2) the term “administration” is not, as she seems to indicate, a synonym for “fellowship”; (3) the manuscript evidence against the reading goes far beyond a “few Egyptian manuscripts” as Metzger’s quotation indicates; (4) one could turn the argument around and say the KJV has “no administration of the mystery”...but that is hardly a meaningful argument [so why does James White include it?]; (5) correctly translating the term for “age” has nothing to do with the New Age; and (6) the “new versions” present Jesus Christ fully, accurately, and without compromise. Riplinger’s accusations are simply groundless.”*

White’s 6 points may briefly be answered as follows.

1. White fails to acknowledge that if the editors of the Textus Receptus apparently went against most of the Greek manuscripts, they could well have had “*a very clear, logical reason*<sup>3 p 207</sup>” for so doing. Likewise the compilers of the earlier English bibles; Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops<sup>11 p 71</sup>. Dr Moorman adds, his emphases, “*“Fellowship” fits the context better than “administration.” See verse 6...the non-citing of evidence on these passages by von Soden and others does not mean that it is lacking but rather that there is a lack of interest on their part. Their chief concern is the gathering of material which shows some affinity with codices Aleph and B for the reconstruction of the N.T. text. The last thing on their minds is the defence of the King James Bible. Thus, until someone is able to gather evidence for these passages from all of the extant items, we will have to be content with these bits of information. This wait will not affect our confidence in God’s preservation of the Scriptures at every point.*”

As Dr Moorman remarks earlier in his treatise<sup>11 p 27</sup>, “*Our extant MSS reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89 Jude 3). After the advent of printing (AD 1450), the necessity of God preserving the MS witness to the text was diminished. Therefore, in some instances the majority of MSS extant today may not reflect at every point what the true, commonly accepted, and majority reading was 500 years ago.*”

2. White has missed the *biblical* connotation of the word for “**dispensation**” Ephesians 3:2, blandly given as “*administration*” in verse 9 in the NIV, NASV, which is that Paul had a God-given pastoral responsibility to reveal to the Gentiles through the Gospel how they were “**fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God**” Ephesians 2:19 – and 3:6, as Dr Moorman indicates. Paul was also grateful for the saints’ “**fellowship in the gospel**” Philippians 1:5, to which was committed to him “**a dispensation of the gospel,**” 1 Corinthians 9:17. Paul wasn’t a mere ‘administrator,’ or bureaucrat as White tries to imply.
3. On the very same page of his book where he first cites Ephesians 3:9, White rejects Acts 8:37 as found in the AV1611 as a manmade attempt to “*“improve” upon what God has revealed*” and Acts 9:5, 6 as found in the AV1611 as an invention of Erasmus’s based on the Vulgate and Acts 26. He also regards Metzger’s and the NASV’s decision to omit “**by Jesus Christ**” from Ephesians 3:9 as “*decisively supported.*”

Yet the AV1611 reading for Acts 9:5, 6 has as much support from the versions and the church fathers as the omission from Ephesians 3:9, together with some Greek manuscript support and the support for Acts 8:37 in the AV1611 is considerably greater than that for the omission from Ephesians 3:9, including over twice

as many Greek manuscripts as Metzger cites. See comments above. Why isn't Acts 8:37 "*decisively supported*" by the modern editors? White describes the number of Greek manuscripts in support of Acts 8:37, at least 30, as "*only a very few*" but the number that Metzger cites, 13, as "*far beyond "a few Egyptian manuscripts."*" Once again, White's 'inconsistency' and 'double standard' with respect to support for the AV1611 is strikingly evident. He should give careful consideration to Proverbs 11:1a, "***A false balance is abomination to the LORD.***"

4. White himself admits that his comment is frivolous, so no further comment is necessary.
5. White's dogmatic assertion overlooks Dr Mrs Riplinger's detailed chapter earlier in her work<sup>14 p 280ff</sup> entitled *The New Earth or a New Age?* where the modern reading for Ephesians 3:9, "*for ages*" is contrasted with that of the AV1611 "***the world***" as one of 27 verses where the same or a similar contrast exists between the NIV, NASV and the AV1611. Westcott and Hort's RV has "*age*" or "*ages*" or "*times*" instead of "***world***" in Romans 16:25, 1 Corinthians 10:11, Ephesians 3:9, 2 Timothy 1:9, Titus 1:2, Hebrews 6:5, 9:26, or 25% of the references that Gail Riplinger cites, showing how New Age doctrine has *gradually* been inserted into the texts of the new versions, according to the principle of Bishop Autun, SJ, "*above all, not too much zeal.*"

The RV also prefigures the NIV, NASV with the subtle readings favourable to New Age 'cycles' in Genesis 1 of "*a second, third, fourth, fifth day*" whereas the AV1611 has the anti-New Age readings, "***the second, third, fourth, fifth day.***"

Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement on page 456 of her work is simply a resume of the more detailed study that she presents earlier in the book. White fails to address any of this material in his subsequent attack<sup>3 p 96ff</sup> on Dr Mrs Riplinger.

The King James translators used the term "***ages***" in Ephesians 2:7, 3:5, 21 and Colossians 1:26, so White cannot accuse them of not "*correctly translating*" the underlying Greek term as necessary. The AV1611's use of the word "***ages***" indicates either past history, Ephesians 3:5, Colossians 1:26 or "***ages to come,***" associated with the "***world without end***" following the establishment of "***a new heaven and a new earth***" 2 Peter 3:13, Ephesians 2:7, 3:21, not a New Age cycle of "*worlds [growing] out worlds*" that Westcott evidently believed<sup>14 p 281</sup> and which "***doctrines of devils***" 1 Timothy 4:1, the new (age) versions clearly allow for in their alterations of "***world***" to "*age*" etc. See evaluation of White's notion that "*age*" is a superior translation to "***world***" in Chapter 6.

6. See discussion in previous chapter where White defends the deletion or shortening by the new versions of names and titles pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ, thereby failing to appreciate the application of Bishop Autun's strategy – see above. In particular, note the findings by Fowler and Salliby on the spurious additions that the NIV makes in order to conceal the deletions or alterations to the Lord's names and titles that it makes in important passages of scripture. Fowler and Salliby show that, contrary to White's assertion, the new versions do NOT "*present Jesus Christ fully, accurately, and without compromise.*" See also remarks above on 1 Timothy 3:16 and 1 John 5:7.

White returns to this subject in his Chapter 8 and a more detailed response will be given there.

For now, in sum, it is White's criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger that "*are simply groundless.*"

The editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> and Nestle all support White's preferences for Ephesians 1:18, 3:9 and 2 Timothy 2:19 against the AV1611. It should again be remembered that none of these editors could be described as God-guided in the compilation of their texts and none of them, apart from Wordsworth, were even saved. See remarks under *Modern 'Scholarly' Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness*.

Dr Moorman<sup>9</sup> p 129, 138, 11 p 71, 74 reveals that the earlier English bibles of Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops' all support the AV1611 readings in Ephesians 1:18, 3:9 and 2 Timothy 2:19, along with the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever. Contrary to White's implication, the reading "*understanding*" in Ephesians 1:18 has support from at least 6 Greek extant manuscripts, as well some patristic support. Dr Moorman states, his emphasis, "*The "eyes of the heart" occurs nowhere else in the Bible. The phrase doesn't set well with scriptural truth, and probably comes from heathen philosophers. Plato spoke about the "eyes of the soul;" and Ovid, speaking of Pythagoras said: "With his mind he approached the gods, though far removed in heaven, and what nature denied to human sight, he drew forth with the eyes of his heart"* (Vincent's Word Studies, p 848).

White would doubtless argue that the expression "*the eyes of your understanding*" likewise occurs nowhere else in scripture but any difficulty is resolved by "*comparing spiritual things with spiritual*" 1 Corinthians 2:13. Any objection from White that this is "*circular reasoning*" – see **Introduction** - is countered by the fact that "*the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever*" 1 Peter 1:23b - which the Lord described as "*my words,*" that "*shall not pass away,*" though "*Heaven and earth shall pass away,*" Matthew 24:35 and "*the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life,*" John 6:63 - is like "*he that is spiritual,*" who "*judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man,*" 1 Corinthians 2:15. Therefore, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows<sup>39, 67</sup> the scripture must define its own terms and be self-interpreting, Genesis 40:8. The bible is not open to manmade or "*private interpretation,*" 2 Peter 1:20 and to use one part to shed light on another is not circular but *scriptural* reasoning.

Dr Ruckman states of Ephesians 1:18 that "*“The eyes of your understanding” are plainly the “eyes” of 1 Samuel 14:27 [where Jonathan’s eyes were “enlightened” by the taste of “a little of this honey” verse 29] and Luke 24:31 [where the Lord opened the eyes of the disciples’ understanding after “he expounded unto them in all the scripture the things concerning himself” verse 27b].* In turn, Psalm 119:30 demonstrates the process of scriptural enlightenment, "*The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple.*" The unbelievers' rejection of the scripture through "*the vanity of their mind*" results in "*the understanding darkened*" and in turn "*the blindness of the heart,*" Ephesians 4:17b, 18. Only the AV1611 readings make this procedure clear.

Of the reading "*fellowship*" versus "*administration*" in Ephesians 3:9, see point 1 above. The phrase "*by Jesus Christ*" in Ephesians 3:9 is supported by the majority of the Greek cursive manuscripts, although of course this support is not "*decisive*" according to Metzger and White. Such support is only "*decisive*" if and when this majority (i.e. von Soden's) reads against the AV1611, e.g. with respect to Acts 8:37, 1 John 5:7. White is at least 'consistent' in that respect.

Dr Moorman states succinctly with respect to the omission of **“by Jesus Christ”** in Ephesians 3:9, *“Another wicked attempt to remove the Deity of Christ from Scripture.”* See also Salliby<sup>61 p 18</sup>, who says of this omission, *“As surely as the Bible “is a lamp unto (our) feet,” just as surely, each of these deletions dim the light a little more.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 6</sup> adds that, *“Eph. 3:9: Metzger's NRSV and Reader's Digest Bible are the epitome of liberalism; he is a part of the faulty foundation on which new versions are built. Metzger's assertions that “there is no reason why if the words [by Jesus Christ] were original, they should have been omitted,” is the height of naivete. Anyone who hasn't noticed that the world omits “Jesus Christ” every chance it gets, is deluded.”*

Like James White.

The AV1611 reading **“Christ”** in 2 Timothy 2:19 has support from 6 cursives and Dr Moorman notes that *“The second half of the verse links the title “Christ” to God, thus declaring His deity. This is weakened and made less distinct by substituting “Lord””* i.e. opening the way for a variety of New Age ‘lords,’ 1 Corinthians 8:5b, in the context.

Note that the expression **“name of the Lord”** occurs 13 times in the New Testament, (and an additional 8 times associated with **“Jesus”**). 7 are pre-crucifixion references in the Gospels, 3 are essentially Old Testament cross-references, Acts 2:21, Romans 10:13, James 5:10. James 5:14 is a reference to the Lord’s healing ministry and the remaining two references, Acts 10:48, 22:16, are in the context of water baptism, where the term **“the Lord”** must be used to apply to all three members of the Godhead<sup>88 p 338-40</sup>. The expression is therefore correct in each of these contexts.

However, **“The Lord”** is named as **“Christ”** in 2 Timothy 2:19 and this name gives added emphasis to the Lord Jesus Christ’s high priestly role with respect to separation from sin, according to Hebrews 7:26.

**“For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens.”**

White then makes the naïve statement that *“What is often not understood by KJV Only advocates is that the KJV translators did not utilize just one Greek text when working on the New Testament. Instead, they drew from a variety of sources, but mainly from Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza. When these sources diverged, the decision lay with the KJV translators themselves.”*

In contrast to White’s assertion, Bible believers have long known that the King James translators utilised a variety of sources for their work<sup>8 p 26</sup>.

*“The following list shows that the translators of 1611 had more than sufficient material for their vital task.*

1. *All preceding printed English and foreign language Bibles. These included the Jesuit Rheims Version.*
2. *The printed Greek texts of Erasmus, Stephanus and Beza.*
3. *The Complutensian Polyglot with the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Old Testament. The translators also had the Antwerp Polyglot of 1569-1572.*
4. *Several important uncial mss. and a great mass of cursive mss.*
5. *The Old Latin.*
6. *The Italic, Gallic and Celtic versions.*

7. *Jerome's Vulgate.*
8. *Variant readings from Codices A and B."*

Of the *results* of the decisions the King's men made with respect to the AV1611 Text, including any concerning divergent sources, Paine<sup>25 p 169</sup> states "*They produced a timeless book. Are we to say that God walked with them in their gardens? Insofar as they believed in their own calling and election, they must have believed that they would have God's help in their task.*"

Neither White nor anyone else in the last 400 years has shown that any of the King James translators' decisions was wrong. This work has already summarised considerable evidence to this effect and will continue to do so.

White then lifts a chart from Dr Hills's work<sup>65 p 220-3</sup>, listing 9 passages of scripture where different editions of the Received Text exhibit different readings; Luke 2:22, 17:36, John 1:28, 16:33, Romans 8:11, 12:11, 1 Timothy 1:4, Hebrews 9:1, James 2:18.

White then states.

*"The KJV New Testament...is a peculiar "Textus Receptus" that differs from any edition that preceded it. While flowing mainly from Erasmus via Stephanus and Beza...it did not come into existence until...1611. Hence, when we speak historically of the Textus Receptus, we are speaking of a text-type that is found in various editions with minor differences between each edition. Most often when the term is used by KJV Only advocates, it refers to the KJV version of the TR...not to any one particular edition of Erasmus, Stephanus, or Beza..."*

*"We have already asserted...the teaching of the TR is the same as the teachings of the Majority Text and any of the modern texts. We have taken the time to note these items simply because of the misuse of the TR by KJV Only advocates...the KJV translators chose between the differing readings of the different editions made by [Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza]. None...would agree with the claims made by the KJV Only believers about their work."*

Again, White seeks to create a false impression. He fails to note the context of Dr Hills's chart, which is a section of his book entitled *The Text of the King James Version – Questions and Answers*.

Dr Hills states, "*When a believer begins to defend the King James Version, unbelievers [White, Kutilek, 'our critic' etc.] immediately commence to bring up various questions and problems to put the believer down and silence him. Let us therefore consider some of these alleged difficulties...*

*"The translators that produced the King James Version relied mainly, it seems, on the later editions of Beza's Greek New Testament, especially his 4<sup>th</sup> edition (1588-9). But also they frequently consulted the editions of Erasmus and Stephanus and the Complutensian Polyglot. According to Scrivener (1884)...out of the 252 passages in which these sources differ sufficiently to affect the English rendering, the King James Version agrees with Beza against Stephanus 113 times, with Stephanus against Beza 59 times, and 80 times with Erasmus, or the Complutensian, or the Latin Vulgate against Beza and Stephanus. Hence the King James Version ought to be regarded not merely as a translation of the Textus Receptus but also as an independent variety of the Textus Receptus."* This author's emphases.

Dr Hills addresses in some detail the various views of the Textus Receptus earlier in his book and genuinely speaks for all bible believers when he states that *“We believe that the formation of the Textus Receptus was guided by the special providence of God. There were three ways in which the editors of the Textus Receptus, Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs, were providentially guided.”*

*“In the first place, they were guided by the manuscripts which God in His providence had made available to them.*

*“In the second place, they were guided by the providential circumstances in which they found themselves.*

*“Then in the third place, and most of all, they were guided by the common faith. Long before the Protestant Reformation, the God-guided usage of the Church had produced throughout Western Christendom a common faith concerning the New Testament text, namely, a general belief that the currently received New Testament text, primarily the Greek text and secondarily the Latin text, was the True New Testament Text which had been preserved by God's special providence.*

*“It was this common faith that guided Erasmus and the other early editors of the Textus Receptus.”*

Dr Hills, whose book has been available for 50 years and has been so widely read by bible believers that White alludes in his next chapter to its author as one of the three main representatives of *The King James Only Camp*, has comprehensively set out the bible believers' long-established perception of the Received Text. That perception encompasses both the Greek Editions of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, Eleziever and the AV1611 *“as an independent variety of the Textus Receptus.”*

White is therefore attempting to deceive in declaring that bible believers *“misuse”* the Textus Receptus.

White's statement that *“The teaching of the TR is the same as the teachings of the Majority Text and any of the modern texts”* is further deception. Dr Moorman effectively answers White in his article<sup>89</sup> *A Reply to Dr. Daniel Wallace's Why I Do Not Think the King James Bible is the Best Translation Available Today.*

Wallace is a staunch White-ally and anti-bible scholarship-onlyist<sup>3 p 6, 151-3, 187-8</sup>. His attitude with respect to *“the teachings”* of the various Greek texts is the same as White's.

Dr Moorman states.

*“Wallace tells us “most textual critics for the past 250 years would say that no doctrine is affected by these changes”. Yes, that is what they and he [and White] say, and it is false. Many of God's faithful servants have over the years compiled long lists of these alterations and omissions. They have set out clearly the extent to which the great doctrines have been weakened and undermined. It can only be due to peer pressure, scholarly pride and wilful blindness that this statement is made. My own list<sup>9</sup> of 356 passages gives a clear demonstration. He cannot merely brush this aside by saying: “Those who vilify the modern translations and the Greek texts behind them have evidently never really investigated the data. Their appeals are based largely on emotion, not evidence.” **Yes, we are filled with emotion when we see our Bible treated in this way, and we have also investigated the data.**”* This author's emphases. Summary examples may be found in this author's earlier work, where alteration and omissions in the new versions weaken major doctrine<sup>8 Chapters 7-14</sup>.

See also remarks in the previous chapter on Philip Schaff's insistence that "*not one [textual variant] affected "an article of faith or a precept of duty which is not abundantly sustained by other and undoubted passages, or by the whole tenor of Scripture teaching."*"

Again, in the last sentence of this extract from his book, White is speaking for the dead but his statement is imprecise, "*None [i.e. none of the editors of the Textus Receptus Greek Editions or the King James translators]...would agree with the claims made by the KJV Only believers about their work.*"

And these claims are...? White should at least pay the reader the courtesy of reviewing such claims at this point, if he is convinced that he knows what they consist of.

Nevertheless, the translators themselves left an unequivocal testimony to their perception of their work. In *The Translators To the Readers, the original preface to the 1611 edition of the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible*<sup>26</sup>, by Dr Miles Smith, Dr Smith concludes.

*"Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one, (for then the imputation of [Pope] Sixtus [V] had been true in some sort, that our people had been fed with gall of Dragons instead of wine, with whey instead of milk:) but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark."*

White quotes this statement in the final part of his Chapter 4<sup>3 p 74</sup> but significantly refrains from commenting on it in any detail.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>39 p 560ff</sup>, her emphases "*"Seven" times "they purge...and purify it..." (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, 'It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...'*

She inserts Dr Smith's conclusion above and continues.

*"The "mark" to which the KJV translators strove was to retain and polish the "perfection of the scriptures" seen in earlier editions. Tyndale himself said of his own edition... "count it as a thing not having his full shape...a thing begun rather than finished...to seek in certain places more proper English"...*

*"The KJV translators wrote of their final "perfected" work*<sup>26</sup>,

*"Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfited [perfected] at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us...the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished..."*

White also quotes<sup>3 p 74</sup> this extract but fails to comment on the import of Dr Smith's description of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible as essentially a *finished* work. Later editions would correct typographical errors and make a number of minor word changes<sup>8 p 230ff</sup> but none of these refinements represents a fundamental shift to the Catholic *text* that underlies most of the new versions<sup>8 Chapters 7, 10, 11</sup>, including the RV, NIV, NRSV, NKJV footnotes and White's NASV. See **Appendix** and Burgon's and Wilkinson's remarks in the **Introduction** to the effect that "*Fundamentally, there are only two streams of bibles...*" White et alia are caught up in the *wrong* stream.

Comparing the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible and its worthy predecessors; Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops etc., with this corrupt text, found also in the Greek editions of Griesbach et al, Dr Smith states, “*and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours far better than their authentic [i.e. Catholic] vulgar.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly notes, her underlining, “*The KJV translators’ assertion that their edition was “perfected” leaves no work left for the NKJV [or NIV, NRSV, NASV etc.] translators but “repentance from dead words,*” a fitting fulfilment of their typographical error mentioned earlier\* (p 551).”

\*Dr Mrs Riplinger indicates that “*the highly distorted Thomas Nelson edition of the Translators to the Reader, printed in their KJV/NKJV Parallel Reference Bible, has a typo which appropriately reads “repentance from dead words.*” She continues, her underlining.

“*The KJV translators saw their Bible as that final English “one,” which no one could say anything “against.” They would not approve of further tampering with the English Bible. The “chief overseer” of the translation said, “If every man’s humor should be followed, there would be no end of translating” [as the NIV Preface states, “the work of translation is never wholly finished”]...The translators remarked regarding the consequent omissions in some ancient Greek manuscripts, as well as Catholic New Testaments. “Neither were there this chopping and changing in the more ancient times only, but also of late [the Hodder & Stoughton 1973 NIV omits “begotten” from John 1:14, 1:18, 3:16, 18, Acts 13:33, Hebrews 1:5, 5:5, 1 John 4:9 but the 1983 Gideon NIV reinserts it<sup>8 p 335, 90, p 15ff</sup>].”*

“*They warned their generation and future ones, who would ignore the Bible or resort to private interpretations or various editions [like James White et alia].*

“*“Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews. Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...[S]tarve not yourselves...he setteth his word before us, to read it...<sup>26</sup>*

“*“Catholics (he meaneth certain of his own side) were in such an humor of translating the Scriptures into Latin, that Satan taking occasion by them...did strive what he could, out of so uncertain and manifold a variety of translations, so to mingle all things, that nothing might seem to be left certain and firm in them...<sup>26</sup>”*

“*The translators wrote of “the printing house of the Vatican” and their translations with “infinite differences...many of them weighty and material...<sup>26</sup>”*

“*“Our adversaries do make so many and so various editions themselves, and do jar so much about the worth and authority of them, they can with no show of equity challenge us for changing and correcting<sup>26</sup>.”*”

This last statement from the translators answers one of the main excuses that modern version supporters like James White habitually produce to justify destroying belief in the AV1611 as the *finished* word of God, as will be seen with respect to the various AV1611 editions.

Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes with an incisive verse for supporters of the modern version.



***“Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment”*** Exodus 23:2.

Concerning Dr Hills’s chart, White has failed to notice that the AV1611 agrees consistently with Beza in 8 of the 9 verses listed. This is actually a higher proportion than the overall differences between the AV1611 and the Greek editions of Erasmus, Stephanus and Beza that Scrivener noted – see above – but the purpose of Dr Hills’s chart is to illustrate, as White himself is forced to acknowledge<sup>3 p 67</sup>, *“some of the most important of these differences... between the various editions of the Textus Receptus,”* not to imply, as White attempts to do, that the AV1611 and its underlying Greek sources, were somehow riddled with *“abnormalities”*<sup>3 p 69</sup>.

As Dr Hills explains, in his comments on the chart that White was careful to omit.

*“This comparison indicates that the differences which distinguish the various editions of the Textus Receptus from each other are very minor. They are also very few. According to Hoskier, the 3rd edition of Stephanus and the first edition of Elzevir differ from one another in the Gospel of Mark only 19 times. Codex B. on the other hand, disagrees with Codex Aleph in Mark 652 times and with Codex D 1,944 times. What a contrast!”*

Especially between these documents, Aleph and B, that White regards respectively<sup>3 p 33</sup> as *“a great treasure”* and *“a...great codex”* and which the NIV designates as *“the most reliable early manuscripts”* and *“the earliest and most reliable manuscripts”* after Mark 16:8 and John 7:52 respectively. Dr Hills continues.

*“The texts of the several editions of the Textus Receptus were God-guided. They were set up under the leading of God's special providence. Hence the differences between them were kept down to a minimum. But these disagreements were not eliminated altogether, for this would require not merely providential guidance but a miracle. In short, God chose to preserve the New Testament text providentially rather than miraculously, and this is why even the several editions of the Textus Receptus vary from each other slightly.*

*“But what do we do in these few places in which the several editions of the Textus Receptus disagree with one another? Which text do we follow? The answer to this question is easy. We are guided by the common faith. Hence we favor that form of the Textus Receptus upon which more than any other God, working providentially, has placed the stamp of His approval, namely, the King James Version, or, more precisely, the Greek text underlying the King James Version. This text was published in 1881 by the Cambridge University Press under the editorship of Dr. Scrivener and there have been eight reprints... We ought to be grateful that in the providence of God the best form of the Textus Receptus is still available to believing Bible students. For the sake of completeness, however, it would be well to place in the margin the variant readings of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs.”*

Note that Dr Hills’s sage comments refer to the specialized study of the Greek Received Text, *not* the substitution of this Text for the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible as the pure word of God. See Dr Mrs Riplinger remarks earlier<sup>39 p 952ff</sup>, in association with the readings of Erasmus and the AV1611 with respect to Revelation 17:8.

The printed Textus Receptus was therefore in almost *“a settled condition”* by the time the King James translators began their work just as the Old Testament had been at the time of the Lord’s First Advent<sup>12 p 181</sup>. Differences in the earlier editions of the Received Text are therefore of considerably less significance than White would have his readers believe and although the AV1611 is an independent form of the Textus Receptus, as Dr Hills states, it is not far removed from the various forms that preceded it.

The exceptional verse is Hebrews 9:1, where Dr Hills states, “*Heb. 9:1. Here Stephanus reads first tabernacle, with the majority of the Greek manuscripts. Erasmus, Beza, Luther, Calvin omit tabernacle with Pap 46 Aleph B D, Peshitta, Latin Vulgate. The King James Version omits tabernacle and regards covenant as implied.*”

The AV1611 reads as follows in Hebrews 9:1.

***“Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary”*** with ***“covenant”*** in italics in the Text. Hebrews 9:2 explains the context.

***“For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary.”***

Inspection of the verses shows that the AV1611 reads correctly. ***“Covenant”*** is correct because the term includes ***“ordinances of divine service”*** and ***“a worldly sanctuary,”*** designated ***“a tabernacle...the first”*** (to be rebuilt, Acts 15:16) in the next verse, containing the artifacts necessary for the ***“ordinances of divine service.”*** Even the modern versions that White favours; NASV, NIV, NRSV, NKJV, bow to the wisdom of the AV1611 translators and read ***“covenant”*** in Hebrews 9:1, which word appears no fewer than 7 times in the 13 verses of the previous chapter, so ***“covenant”*** clearly fits the context of Hebrews 9:1.

In sum, White cannot reasonably imply, as he attempts to do, that the King James translators made haphazard guesses in their selection of readings from the sources available to them. As Dr Kilbye’s anecdote demonstrates, the King’s men were most scholarly and astute in their use of sources<sup>8 p 26</sup>.

Unlike James White and his cronies.

Of the remaining verses that Dr Hills has listed, the modern versions and modern Greek editions present a confused picture, 1 Corinthians 14:33a.

The NIV, NKJV read with the AV1611 in John 16:33, Romans 12:11 – discussed earlier, 1 Timothy 1:4, James 2:18. These verses require little further comment, except with respect to the NASV renderings and those of the various Greek editions. See below.

The NKJV also reads with the AV1611 in Luke 2:22, 17:36, John 1:28, though disputing the AV1611 readings in its notes, along with that of John 16:33.

The NASV, NRSV read with the AV1611 in Romans 12:11, James 2:18 and the NRSV agrees with the AV1611 in 1 Timothy 1:4.

The NASV, NRSV read, ***“have tribulation”*** in John 16:33 instead of the AV1611 reading ***“shall have tribulation.”***

The NASV has ***“administration of God”*** in 1 Timothy 1:4 instead of the AV1611 reading ***“godly edifying.”***

The NIV, NASV, NRSV read against the AV1611 in Luke 2:22, 17:36 (the NASV brackets the verse), John 1:28. The NIV reads with the JB, NWT in Luke 2:22 and with the DR, JR, JB, NWT in John 1:28. See ***Appendix***.

The NKJV joins with the DR, JR, NIV, NASV, NRSV, JB, NWT in Romans 8:11 in rejecting the AV1611 reading ***“by his Spirit”*** for the weaker expression ***“through his Spirit”*** or similar in the other versions. See ***Appendix***. This expression is not found in an AV1611. The expression ***“through the Spirit”*** is found in Acts 21:4, Romans 8:13, Galatians 5:5, Ephesians 2:22, 1 Peter 1:22, in the context of the work of the Spirit of God in the believer.

However, the expression “*by his S(s)pirit*” is found in passages associated with the attributes of God, thereby affirming the Deity of the Third Person of the Godhead; in Job 26:13, with respect to creation, in Romans 8:11, with respect to the bestowal of eternal *physical* life on the believer, 1 Corinthians 2:10, with respect to the revelation of God to the believer and Ephesians 3:16, with respect to the bestowal of God’s strength in the believer. The modern versions weaken these revelations.

Note that the NASV, to which White is a hired consultant<sup>38</sup>, leads the modern versions in departing from the AV1611 readings in Dr Hills’s chart most often, in no fewer than 6 of the 9 verses cited. It is not surprising, therefore, that White would attempt to obtain tacit support from the Received Text for his ‘preferred’ version by trying to cast doubt on the validity of the readings that the King’s men selected.

Berry’s Edition of Stephanus comes to White’s assistance in these exceptional cases, departing, as Hills’s chart indicates, from the AV1611 in all the verses apart from John 1:28, where the text reads “*Bethabara beyond Jordan,*” as the AV1611 does.

The reading “*Bethany*” is found in the editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> and Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition. The modern versions are clearly wrong because, as any Bible map of the Holy Land in the First Century will show, Bethany is not “*beyond Jordan,*” but *west* of the Jordan River.

Regrettably, even normally reliable Bible dictionaries like *Unger’s* and *The New Compact Bible Dictionary* invent a second ‘Bethany’ to appease ‘modern scholarship.’ Nevertheless, the *New Compact* is forced to confess, “*nothing is known of its location except that it is beyond the Jordan.*”

Yeah, right...☹. The *Oxford Bible Atlas* can’t find Bethany # 2 either...

Although the modern reading does not directly impinge on a so-called major ‘fundamental of the faith,’ it is such an elementary error that an ‘educated’ sceptic\* could easily use it to cast doubt on the scriptural record as a whole and thereby dissuade the gullible\* from searching the Gospel of John any further. The dissuasion is potentially serious because John’s Gospel has been written “*that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name*” John 20:31b and it is often the first portion of scripture that an unbeliever reads.

\*The two might be one and the same individual, of course.

The 1624 Eleziever Edition of the Received Text<sup>62</sup> has “*her purification*” in Luke 2:22, “*Bethabara*” in John 1:28, includes Luke 17:36\* and reads “*building up*” in 1 Timothy 1:4. Eleziever and Lachmann read, “*will have*” in John 16:33. Eleziever and Tischendorf read “*by his Spirit*” as the AV1611 in Romans 8:11 and Eleziever, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth and Nestle agree with the AV1611’s “*serv-ing the Lord*” in Romans 12:11 – see remarks earlier on this verse. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth and Nestle omit “*tabernacle*” from Hebrews 9:1 and read “*without*” in James 2:18 with the AV1611.

\*Although Luke 17:36 is not found in von Soden’s ‘Majority,’ Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 49</sup> lists considerable support for this verse, including the Great and Bishops’ Bibles, over 40 Greek manuscripts, plus the Old Latin, Peshitta and other old versions and several patristic citations from the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries, including Tatian, in 172 AD. See also this author’s summary<sup>8 p 71</sup>. The extent, antiquity and variety of support for this verse could well be “*decisive,*” ☺ in the words of White and Metzger<sup>3 p 179</sup>. Especially when the JB, NWT omit Luke 17:36, along with the NIV.

Eleziever's Text is not given<sup>62</sup> in Hebrews 9:1, James 2:18 but this post-AV1611 Edition of the Textus Receptus clearly supports the AV1611 in at least 7 of the 9 "*most important of these differences... between the various editions of the Textus Receptus*" that Dr Hills lists.

This level of agreement is almost as high as that between Beza and the AV1611. This is not surprising because the Eleziever editions mainly followed Beza's<sup>65 p 208</sup> but this correspondence in itself serves to reinforce the point made above, that the Textus Receptus was under God's guidance steadily converging to "*a settled condition*" in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, a condition now fully realized in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bibles of 1769 onwards<sup>8 p 35, 225ff</sup>.

Minor textual changes notwithstanding, "*the water of life*" of the AV1611 has flowed freely for everyone "*that is athirst*," Revelation 21:6 since the first year of its publication and White is only trying to muddy "*waters deep*" where the Lord has made good His promise to "*cause their rivers to run like oil*" Ezekiel 32:14.

The rebuke that Lord delivered to the wayward members of His flock in Ezekiel's time applies equally to White, Kutilek, Wallace, 'our critic' et alia.

***"Seemeth it a small thing unto you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures? and to have drunk of the deep waters, but ye must foul the residue with your feet?"*** Ezekiel 34:18.

The AV1611 reading "*her purification*" in Luke 2:22 instead of "*their purification*" has support<sup>8 p 68-9, 9 p 86, 55 p 150ff</sup> from 5-6 Greek manuscripts and the Old Latin but the AV1611 reading is at variance with most of the manuscript and version witnesses. Nevertheless, as Dr Holland explains, "*Contextually, the reading must stand as reflected in the KJV. Under the Levitical Law [Leviticus 12:2-4] a woman was considered unclean after giving birth and needed purification.*" Dr Moorman states, his emphasis, "*The Law in Leviticus required purification **only** for the mother – not the child, not the father...Despite the manuscript support for "their purification" the reading is clearly wrong. It contradicts scripture and brings dishonour to Christ.*"

Dr Moorman's comment highlights the fact – heavily reinforced by Dr Mrs Riplinger's work<sup>39</sup> – that the manuscripts, versions, patristic quotations and printed editions in the original languages are witnesses to the text of scripture that usually support the AV1611 against the modern versions. But these witnesses – such as are extant and have been collated to date – are not infallible. The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible is infallible.

And what James White and others contemptuously refer to as "*King James Onlyism*" is really "*King James AUTHORITARIANISM.*"

This is what White, Kutilek, 'our critic' and the rest can't or couldn't stomach. It punctures their egos and threatens their incomes.

Dr Ruckman's comments<sup>2</sup> on Luke 2:22 are as follows.

*"(Luke 2:22)... "Her purification" is an "error" according to all Alexandrians for the Greek texts say... "their purification." Thus the NIV and NASV are correct in saying "THEIR purification." The only thing wrong with this is that it is a lie. Joseph didn't need any purification according to the Biblical source for the Biblical quotation (Leviticus 12). Only the WOMAN needed to be purified; look at it...*

*"So here is a case where the AV translators saw a Biblical problem that White didn't see, or didn't want to see, because he was dead set on FORCING THE BIBLE TO CONTRA-*

*DICT ITSELF. If he could use the Greek to do this with he would do it; he did it. If the AV is in "error," then the NIV and NASV have ten times as bad an error, for they made a false document out of the "Law of Moses."*

In sum, the bible believer can have "absolute certainty"<sup>3 p 95</sup> in following the AV1611 for all the verses that White<sup>3 p 68</sup> lists above from Dr Hills's book, regardless of the variations in the TR. How the modern bible critic like James White sorts out the variant readings by a process of "individual responsibility"<sup>3 p 95</sup> is problematic.

White next calls into question<sup>3 p 69-70</sup> whether or not the Textus Receptus was "the text of the reformation," or the "text of the Reformers." He maintains that although Luther and Calvin used "what would become known as the TR...they used this text by default, not by choice...it was a matter of using what was available."

But if the minority text is superior to that underlying the AV1611 – and White believes that it is – then why didn't God make it available in time for the Protestant Reformation? That "great codex," Vaticanus, was found in 1481<sup>8 p 13</sup>, nearly 40 years before Martin Luther<sup>55 p 64</sup> nailed his *Ninety-five Theses* to the church door at Wittenberg in 1517, kick-starting the Reformation.

And 30 years *after* the invention of the printing press<sup>12 p 345</sup> in 1450. By 1481, the process of printing should have been well established.

Therefore, why didn't God use printed editions of that "great codex," Vaticanus, to accompany the Reformation, instead of the editions of Erasmus?

And why didn't God use vernacular translations of Jerome's Vulgate, for the same purpose? Vulgate support for the NIV versus the AV1611 is approximately 50-50<sup>9 p 30-33</sup>, so it incorporates many of the minority "text-type" readings that White favours.

Wilkinson has shown that the papists had translated Jerome's Vulgate into Italian and French by the year 1400, well in advance of the invention of the printing press<sup>12 p 209, 223</sup>.

Wilkinson has shown further that the Jesuits produced their first English translation of Jerome's Vulgate in 1582, certainly in time to carry forward the English Reformation into the 17<sup>th</sup> century, if God had favoured the minority text, which, in White's opinion<sup>3 p 69</sup>, expressed "in the strongest possible terms," embodies the same teaching in its present form as Nestle's and the United Bible Societies texts as does the Textus Receptus.

However, God didn't. And White's opinion is grossly in error. As Dean Burgon states<sup>13 p 343</sup>, also "in the strongest possible terms" – see comments on Aleph and B in the previous chapter.

*"Dr. Hort contends that [the Truth of Scripture] more than half lay perdu on a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; - Dr. Tischendorf, that it had been deposited in a waste-paper basket in the convent of S. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai, - from which he rescued it on the 4<sup>th</sup> February 1859\*: - neither, we venture to think, a very likely circumstance. We incline to believe that the Author of Scripture hath not by any means shown Himself so unmindful of the safety of the Deposit, as those distinguished gentlemen imagine."*

\*Surely God could have brought such "a great treasure" to light in time for the Reformation – if White's assessment of Sinaiticus<sup>3 p 33</sup> is correct? The Dean continues.

*"Are we asked for the ground of our opinion? We point without hesitation to the 998 Copies which remain: to the many ancient Versions; to the many venerable Fathers, - any one of whom we hold to be a more trustworthy authority for the Text of Scripture, where*

*he speaks out plainly, than either Codex B or Codex Aleph, - aye, or than both of them put together. Behold, (we say,) the abundant provision which the All-wise One hath made for the safety of the Deposit... We hope to be forgiven if we add, (not without a little warmth,) that we altogether wonder at the perversity, the infatuation, the blindness, - which is prepared to make light of all these precious helps, in order to magnify two of the most corrupt codices in existence."*

Unfortunately for White, he cannot effectively rewrite history, so he cites Dr Hills's reference to Calvin who suggested approximately 20 changes in the Received Text New Testament. White then concludes that "*the assertion that the TR was the "text of the Reformation" is more than slightly misleading... research and study into [text-types] had not yet sufficiently advanced to allow the Reformers to have any particularly weighty opinion in matters that were not, at that time, under discussion."*

Not according to the King James translators, to whom White turns next – see below. They regarded their Text as "*perfited,*" perfectly fitted, or "*perfected.*" See both Dr Smith's and Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks above. And it was – and is.

To quote Dr Smith, with respect to the labour of the King's men on Bible translation, "*to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark.*"

See Cloud's statement at the beginning of this chapter<sup>6 Part 3</sup>. With reference to Frederick Nolan's extensive researches, he refutes White's case, which essentially deals with one reformer only, as follows.

*"NOLAN SHOWS THAT THE REFORMATION EDITORS DID NOT FOLLOW THE RECEIVED TEXT BECAUSE THEY LACKED SUFFICIENT TEXTUAL EVIDENCE, BUT BECAUSE THEY CONSCIOUSLY CHOSE TO REJECT THE CRITICAL READINGS. (Contrast this with White's statement on page 69 that the Reformation editors "used this text by default, not by choice.")"*

In spite of his citation of Dr Hills on Calvin's textual guesswork, White fails to include Dr Hills's conclusion<sup>65 p 208</sup>.

*"The Elzevir Editions — The Triumph of the Common Faith*

*"The Elzevirs were a family of Dutch printers with headquarters at Leiden. The most famous of them was Bonaventure Elzevir, who founded his own printing establishment in 1608 with his brother Matthew as his partner and later his nephew Abraham. In 1624 he published his first edition of the New Testament and in 1633 his 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. His texts followed Beza's editions mainly but also included readings from Erasmus, the Complutensian, and the Latin Vulgate. In the preface to the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition the phrase Textus Receptus made its first appearance. "You have therefore the text now received by all (textum ab omnibus receptum) in which we give nothing changed or corrupt."*

*"This statement has often been assailed as a mere printer's boast or "blurb", and no doubt it was partly that. But in the providence of God it was also a true statement. For by this time the common faith in the current New Testament text had triumphed over the humanistic tendencies which had been present not only in Erasmus but also Luther, Calvin, and Beza. The doubts and reservations expressed in their notes and comments had been laid aside and only their God-guided texts had been retained. The Textus Receptus really was the text received by all. Its reign had begun and was to continue unbroken for 200 years. In England Stephanus' 3<sup>rd</sup> edition was the form of the Textus Receptus generally preferred, on the European continent Elzevir's 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.*

*“Admittedly there are a few places in which the Textus Receptus is supported by only a small number of manuscripts, for example, Eph. 1:18, where it reads, eyes of your understanding, instead of eyes of your heart; and Eph. 3:9, where it reads, fellowship of the mystery, instead of dispensation of the mystery. We solve this problem, however, according to the logic of faith. Because the Textus Receptus was God-guided as a whole, it was probably God-guided in these few passages also.”*

Ephesians 1:18, 3:9 have been discussed above. This author’s conclusion is that these, and other exceptional passages like them with limited manuscript support, were nevertheless God-guided. Even though two different “preferred” editions of the Textus Receptus were in circulation at the time of publication of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible, in itself different from both of them<sup>65 p 220</sup>, the providence of God ensured that the AV1611 became *the* Holy Bible for English-speaking believers and indeed the catalyst for the worldwide missionary movement of the 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>8 General Introduction, p 14</sup>, while Stephanus’s Edition remained an authentic representation of the New Testament textual sources from which the AV1611 had sprung.

White does not show otherwise.

He next turns his attention to the King James translators’ Preface<sup>26</sup>, introducing his remarks with a further criticism of bible believers as follows<sup>3 p 71</sup>.

*“It is very common for KJV Only advocates to attack such men as Westcott and Hort for being “baby sprinklers,” yet the KJV was born in the heart of such a system of theology. The inconsistency of attacking modern translations due to the alleged theological irregularities of those associated with them while overlooking the very same problems with the KJV is striking.”*

So striking that White here fails to provide a single example of how “baby sprinklers” theology influenced the translation of the AV1611, a charge he repeats in his notes<sup>3 p 88</sup> with respect to the Calvinism of John Rainolds, who led the petition to King James for the new translation, versus the anti-Calvinist (and correct) stance of Dr Mrs Riplinger, again without substantiation, although he later mounts a personal attack against Gail Riplinger, which will be addressed in the next chapter.

White states of John Rainolds in his notes, citing Paine<sup>25 p 84</sup>, that “*he urged the study of the Bible in Greek and Hebrew, “not out of the books of translation.”*” That is, according to White, the words of the AV1611 can be altered as necessary by resorting to “*the original tongues,*” thereby justifying all modern (per)versions and White’s hired consultancy for the NASV<sup>38</sup>. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s observation<sup>39 p 561</sup> is cited again, for emphasis.

*“The KJV translators’ assertion that their edition was “perfected” leaves no work left for the NKJV [or NIV, NRSV, NASV etc.] translators but “repentance from dead words,” a fitting fulfilment of their typographical error mentioned earlier (p 551).”* And no more money to be made by James White for attacking “*the scripture of truth,*” Daniel 10:21.

White neglects to inform his readers that Rainolds’s exhortation to study the bible “*in Greek and Hebrew*” was made “*years before*” the work began on the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible, according to Paine. Rainolds’s concern in this respect was no doubt what partly motivated him to petition<sup>25 p 1</sup> the King James I as he did at Hampton Court on Monday January 16<sup>th</sup> 1604.

*“May your Majesty be pleased to direct that the Bible be now translated, such versions as are extant not answering to the original.”*

By 1611, the labours of the King's men had produced the Version that has in every respect been wholly successful "*in answering to the original,*" at least according to the endorsement of the Principal Author since that time.

It is also "*striking*" that White provides no examples of bible believers attacking Westcott and Hort "*for being 'baby sprinklers.'*" No doubt partly because this is not the essential reason for criticisms levelled at them, for example by Burgon, who also believed in infant baptism.

Westcott and Hort are rightly censured for their sin of bible corruption. See comments under *The Revision Conspiracy* and remarks following. See also this author's summaries elsewhere<sup>8 p 40ff, 283ff</sup>. Wilkinson<sup>12 p 278</sup> documents the major anti-scriptural attitudes of Westcott and Hort that were the driving forces for revision. They do *not* emphasise "*baby sprinklers*" theology. With respect to Westcott and Hort, Wilkinson cites:

- Their Higher Criticism
- Their Mariolatry
- Their Anti-Protestantism
- Their Tendency to Evolution
- Their (Romish) Ritualism - of which infant baptism is but one of *seven* 'sacraments'<sup>91</sup>
- Their Papal Atonement Doctrine
- Their Collusion Previous to Revision

Dr Mrs Riplinger adds rightly<sup>14 p 397ff, 515ff</sup>, their occultism and heathen philosophy. Wilkinson cites 43 important passages of scripture where Westcott and Hort's RV diverges from the AV1611 according to Westcott and Hort's antagonism towards the Received Text. The NIV follows the RV in 39 of them. See *Appendix, Tables A5-A8*.

Again, White would be wise to heed Solomon's admonition.

**"A false balance is abomination to the LORD"** Proverbs 11:1a.

Cloud<sup>6 Part 3</sup> reinforces this point, concerning Westcott and Hort's apostasy.

*"WHITE DOWNPLAYS THE THEOLOGICAL APOSTASY OF WESTCOTT-HORT, IMPLYING THAT WESTCOTT AND HORT WERE TYPICAL ANGLICANS LIKE THE 17<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY AUTHORIZED VERSION TRANSLATORS AND THE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY JOHN BURGON.*

*"White says, for example, "It is very common for KJV Only advocates to attack such men as Westcott and Hort for being 'baby sprinklers,' yet the KJV was born in the heart of such a system of theology" (White, p. 71). In another place White says: "As the KJV Only movement thrives most in conservative, independent Baptist circles, it is normally enough just to point out that Westcott and Hort were Anglicans, and hence 'baby sprinklers' as one harsh KJV Only proponent puts it. ...The fact that the KJV was translated by 'baby-sprinkling' Anglicans does not seem to bother those who bring up Westcott and Hort, however" (White, pp. 122,123).*

*"I do not doubt that some KJV defenders have made something of the fact that Westcott and Hort practiced infant baptism while ignoring the fact that most of the King James Version translators were infected with the same error, but I have examined practically everything which has been published on this subject and I can testify that White is missing*



the mark by MILES. The point commonly raised against Westcott and Hort is not their denominational peculiarities but their theological modernism, not their views on baptism but their views on the Bible and on Christ's atonement and other foundational doctrines.

"At considerable expense I have collected most of the books which were published by Westcott and Hort, and I can assure my readers that they were infected with the modernism which was sweeping across the world in their day and with the Romanistic sympathies which were prevailing within 19th-century Anglicanism. John William Burgon, an Anglican who was contemporary with Westcott and Hort, strongly affirmed biblical infallibility, while both Westcott and Hort questioned it. Burgon strongly affirmed the biblical view of the atonement, while Westcott and Hort questioned it. Westcott and Hort represented the liberal Romanized wing of late 19th-century Anglicanism, while Burgon represented the staunchly conservative anti-Roman wing. The reader is encouraged to read Burgon's work on biblical inspiration and his work against Roman Catholicism. The titles are included in the bibliography in my book *For Love of the Bible* and these out-of-print works can be viewed by microfiche in many key theological libraries...

"While some Evangelicals and even some Fundamentalists have come to the defense of Westcott and Hort and have contended that they were theologically sound, these (perhaps) fail to understand the nature of Westcott-Hort's theological apostasy. Like many Neo-orthodox and Modernistic theologians, Westcott and Hort did not so much openly deny the doctrines of the Word of God directly; instead they undermined these doctrines with clever doubt, with subtle questioning. Dr. D. A. Waite, who has examined the writings of Westcott and Hort in great detail, testifies: "Westcott's attack on the bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ is not by any means a direct clash of out-and-out denial, but rather an adroit, skillful, oblique undermining of the bodily resurrection of Christ by means of a re-definition of terms" (Waite, *Westcott's Denial of Bodily Resurrection, The Bible for Today*, 1983, p. 8).

"Dr. Waite's views on this matter are not based on a cursory look at Westcott and Hort's theology. He has examined the writings of these men probably as extensively as anyone speaking on the subject today. Certainly he has given much time and care to this research...I have found Dr. Waite to be miles more dependable than James White and his crowd. As a background for his book *Heresies of Westcott & Hort*, Waite studied 1,291 pages of the writings of these men. Based on this research he makes the following charges (among others)<sup>92 p 8ff.</sup>:

"Westcott and Hort held a vague or erroneous position on inspiration, revelation, or inerrancy.

"Westcott embraced the heresy of the universal 'Fatherhood of God.'

"Westcott denies that God had to be 'propitiated.'

"Westcott taught that men could be 'divine' in some way.

"Westcott espoused 'evolution' in various ways.

"Westcott had a heretical theory of man's sinfulness and depravity, believing in man's perfectibility in various ways.

"Westcott and Hort failed to affirm the personality of the Devil, calling him only a 'power.'

"Westcott and Hort denied that Heaven is a place, speaking of it as a 'state.'

““Westcott believed that the ‘redemptive efficacy of Christ’s work’ was to be found ‘in his whole life’ rather than in his death.

““Westcott questioned the eternal pre-existence of the Lord Jesus Christ.

““Westcott and Hort denied the deity of Jesus Christ.

““Westcott explained away some of the miracles of Christ.

““Westcott and Hort denied or gave a false meaning to the literal, bodily resurrection of Christ.

““Westcott and Hort had a false and heretical view of the vicarious, substitutionary sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

“For a discerning overview of the theology of Westcott and Hort, see Dr. Waite’s *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort: As Seen in Their Own Writings*. Also *Heresies of Westcott & Hort*. Both are available from *The Bible for Today*, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108.”

White also tries his hand at innuendo, by questioning the motives of some of the translators. Dr Holland replies<sup>4, 55 p 91</sup>.

“The translators of the KJV are the focus of White’s book in chapter four. “The KJV translators were not infallible human beings,” White points out. “Some, in fact, may have harbored less than perfect motivations for their work” (p. 70). No one claims the KJV translators, or even the original writers, were infallible. It is the word of God that is infallible, not men. God can use fallible men to produce an infallible book. Also, White is very vague in his statement. What is meant by “may have”? Where is the proof of such a statement? The only “evidence” White offers is a footnote where William Barlow, the head of the translators at Westminster, is quoted as saying the king of England was “sacred by holy unction” (p.88). This quote is cited from Gustavus S. Paine’s book, “*The Men Behind the King James Version*” (Baker Book House 1959, p. 43). Paine does not suggest on that page that Barlow or any of the other translators had any motives less than pure. Instead he says, “About kings and queens, Barlow was always sound,” and that “King James greatly approved of him.” Where is the imperfect motivation and who are the “some”?”

White lists several of the 15 rules for translation<sup>25 p 70-1, 63 p 25-7</sup> given to the King James translators and makes several observations<sup>3 p 72</sup>. These and the answers follow in succession, for the most contentious of White’s observations.

“[The rules] reveal that...the KJV relied heavily upon previous translations, prompting us to ask the KJV Only advocate, “When the KJV gives that is identical to the Bishop’s Bible, was the Bishop’s Bible inspired and inerrant in the place, even before 1611?””

The Bishops’ Bible was an authentic forerunner to the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible – see Dr Vance’s remarks under *The Revision Conspiracy*. If White was not so contemptuous of Dr Mrs Riplinger, he could learn much from her researches. She writes<sup>39 p 131ff</sup>.

“Professor Allen writes, “...[the King James translators] regarded the Bishops’ text...as a sound one, most of their revision consists in rubbing and polishing...”

Giving numerous examples of verse comparisons between the Bishops’ Bible and the AV1611, Dr Mrs Riplinger explains.

*“This author’s word for word collation of the changes in the Bishops’ New Testament, made by the King James Bible translators, indicates that these changes were made to accomplish the following:*

1. *Make the Bible even more memorizable and singable...*
2. *Ensure continuity and cohesiveness...through the use of repeated sounds, letters, and words.*
3. *Give the Bible a vocabulary which clearly distinguishes it from the voice of man.*
4. *Ensure that the Greek and Hebrew texts were transparently shown so that outside reference books were not needed.”*

She explains further that, *“God...alone knows how he programmed the brain to receive and use information...The upcoming chapters will explain and demonstrate how our God-designed mind ascribes meanings to words, sentences and paragraphs in his God-designed Bible [the AV1611].”*

White then states, without evidence, *“Anglican ecclesiology had an impact upon the KJV’s translation, a charge that has been made ever since the KJV appeared.”*

It is a charge that has been made *falsely*, *“ever since the KJV appeared.”*

It is the same charge that ‘our critic’ made<sup>8 p 217ff</sup>.

*“Our critic then states that the AV1611 was “essentially a Church of England version...a typical Anglican compromise” and insists that “It was Anglicanism which secured its triumph and that became complete after the Restoration of 1660.””*

This falsehood is answered as follows, with references updated.

*“Not according to Gustavus Paine<sup>25 p 163</sup>, who says, “The Puritans fought their way forward. The 1611 Bible by its own worth was making itself welcome throughout the country, for those on both sides needed the best modern texts with which to fight their doctrinal skirmishes. High churchmen in greater numbers began to use the 1611 version, which in centuries to come would be the sole bond uniting the countless English-speaking Protestant sects.””*

Dr Ruckman states<sup>18, p 123, 8 p 218-9</sup>, *““We are reminded ten times a year that (the translators) were baby-sprinkling Anglicans under a King who had no use for Baptists; you are NOT told they produced THE BOOK that built the NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION IN AMERICA and produced the ten largest Sunday Schools the world has ever seen. NO WRITER ON THE SUBJECT OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE GIVES YOU HALF THE “FACTS.” He deals only with the bare substance: the number of translators (54), the number of companies (six - at Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster), the effeminacy of King James, Hugh Broughton’s criticism of the translation, King James’ “anti-Presbyterianism,” and the archaic language of the “original.” This is the stock-and-trade of twentieth century apostate scholarship.*

*““No mention is usually made of the Jesuit plot TO KILL THE KING AND BOMB THE PARLIAMENT THAT HAD CALLED FOR THE TRANSLATION (1604). No mention is made of the fact that the Dedicatory identifies the Pope as the “man of sin” (2 Thess. 2:3), though NO TRANSLATION SINCE HAS DARED TO BRING UP THE SUBJECT.*

*““No mention is found of a supernatural chapter and verse numbering system that would astound a professional gambler in Las Vegas, although the SCHOLAR’S UNION simply ignores it as “verse numbers made while riding horseback.” No mention is made of an*

*order of Books that is AGAINST the Hebrew original manuscripts (scholar's cliché: more properly "ANY set of Hebrew manuscripts making up the Orthodox Hebrew canon"), so that the PREMILLENIAL COMING OF CHRIST is indicated by the order of those Books - ALTHOUGH THE TRANSLATORS WERE NOT PREMILLENIAL.*

*"Finally, no mention is made of the amazing fact that, to this day, this Book can be taught to children 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 years old without ANY OTHER VERSION, and they can get saved, called to preach, live separated lives, and grow up as NON-BABY SPRINKLING, PREMILLENIAL ANTI-CATHOLICS."*

White doesn't mention any of these subjects either. He adds that, according to the rules cited, *"translations were to follow the use of the early Fathers of the Christian faith, again a practice that would be inconsistent with the viewpoint of most fundamental KJV Only advocates."*

White does not give the full statement of the rule under consideration, which is Rule 4. It states<sup>63 p 26</sup>, *"When a Word hath divers Significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most of the Ancient Fathers, being agreeable to the Propriety of the Place, and the Analogy of the Faith."*

White omitted the clause *"being agreeable to the Propriety of the Place, and the Analogy of the Faith."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger explains<sup>39 p 586</sup> that *"Rule 4 stated that when a word has more than one meaning, the translators should use a word which is agreeable to the Propriety of the Place (context), and the Analogy of the Faith (parallel verses with the built-in dictionary)." She illustrates<sup>39 p 286ff</sup> the application of Rule 4 under the heading *The KJV's Built-in Dictionary* and in her earlier book, *The Language of the King James Bible*.*

She then explains<sup>39 p 512ff</sup> *"Today's lexicons spin their definitions from spiders' webs woven with the lines of the Greek philosophers (e.g. Origen, Clement) and pagan writers (e.g. Plato)...the KJV translators (e.g. Saville, Bois, and Downes and others) looked at Greek words 'in use' in entire contexts written by godly Christians, like the ancient Greek pastor, John Chrysostom."*

Once again, Dr Mrs Riplinger's researches would have greatly enlightened James White, if he wasn't so contemptuous of both her and it.

However, as Paul said, **"But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant"** 1 Corinthians 14:38.

White also takes issue<sup>3 p 72</sup> with the observation that *"quite unfortunately, a number of the translators died during the translation process itself."* He dismisses this observation as unimportant because *"people died very regularly in seventeenth-century England, including godly scholars. But the KJV Only argument...would lead us to believe that God was in some way showing His displeasure at the translation of the KJV. Such is, obviously, not the case at all."*

But he relates these deaths to the reports that *"some modern textual critics or translators have been "struck dumb" or have even died, this allegedly proving evidence of the divine wrath against them for tampering with the KJV."* It is interesting that although he off-handedly dismisses the implications of these reports as mere conspiracy theories, White carefully avoids any attempt to refute them. He also fails to mention any who have actually died, so he may be exaggerating in this respect, unless he is making a vague reference to Spurgeon, who passed away<sup>8 p 281-3</sup> a year after he first preached from the Revised Version.

Strangely, White also avoids mentioning the writers who summarised these reports – none other than Dr Ruckman and Gail Riplinger<sup>14 p 446ff</sup>, whom White otherwise assiduously attacks<sup>3 p 96ff</sup>.

Perhaps, for once, White has enough insight to exercise caution with respect to this topic and heed the warning of Solomon, especially insofar as he issues it *twice*.

***“A prudent man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself: but the simple pass on, and are punished”*** Proverbs 22:3, 27:12

White is most likely basing his comments about the deaths of the King James translators on the disclosures of the late ex-Jesuit priest Dr Alberto Rivera,<sup>93</sup> who stated that some of the translators were murdered. Ashley Mote<sup>94 p 126</sup>, British author and long-term researcher against the Vatican-inspired European Union has written, *“King James authorised translation of the Bible into English was scorned by Rome. At the time, the murder of some of the translators was attributed to agents of the pope.”* It is possible that Mote may have obtained his material from Chick Publications. No references are given.

Although Paine does not overtly subscribe to the belief that any of the translators were murdered, he notes<sup>25 p 148ff</sup> in his chapter *Rewards and Sequels* the deaths of no fewer than 14 of them in the decade immediately following the publication of their Bible *“as if their labours on the Bible had been too much.”*

Paine’s record does not prove Jesuitical murder but Wylie<sup>95 p 585</sup> is unequivocal about the ongoing work of such assassins in the years following the Gun Powder Plot of 1605. With reference to the death of King Charles II on February 6<sup>th</sup>, 1684, Wylie states.

*“If one spoke of the king’s death he had to be careful in what terms he did so. His words were caught up by invisible auditors, and a hand was stretched out from the darkness to punish the imprudence of indiscreet remarks. A physician who gave it as his opinion that the king had been poisoned was seized with a sudden illness, the symptoms of which closely resembled those of the king, whom he followed to the grave in a few days. But at Rome it was not necessary to observe the same circumspection. The death of Charles II was there made the theme of certain orations, which eulogised it as singularly opportune, and it was delicately insinuated that his brother [the Duke of York, later James II, 1685-88] was not without some share in the merit of a deed that was destined to introduce a day of glory to the Roman Church and the realm of England.”*

Wylie’s comments lend credibility to the conclusion that the deaths of several of the King James translators in rapid succession, clearly regarded by Paine as unusual, even for the 17<sup>th</sup> century, may also have been thought by Rome to be *“singularly opportune”* with Rome herself *“not without some share in the merit of”* deeds leading to these apparently untimely deaths.

Such a conclusion does not, in the words of James White, *“lead us to believe that God was in some way showing His displeasure at the translation of the KJV.”*

But it does *“lead us to believe that”* ROME was definitely showing HER *“displeasure at the translation of the KJV.”*

When he specifically addresses the Preface to the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible, White claims that *“One of the most eloquent arguments against KJV Onlyism is provided...by the translators themselves.”* He then uses extracts from *The Translators to the Reader*<sup>26</sup> to justify the modern translations, as follows<sup>3 p 73ff</sup>. (Note that, for brevity, selections have been made from the extracts that White quotes, as appropriate. Again, responses have been inserted only for White’s most contentious comments.)

*“The KJV translators faced the same arguments that are hurled against the godly men who worked on the NASB or NIV... “Why prepare a new translation?” Note their reply<sup>26</sup>.*

*““Many men's mouths have been open a good while (and yet are not stopped) with speeches about the Translation so long in hand, or rather perusals of Translations made before: and ask what may be the reason, what the necessity of the employment: Hath the Church been deceived, say they, all this while?...”*

*““That is, “Do we condemn the ancient? In no case: but after the endeavors of them that were before us, we take the best pains we can in the house of God.””...*

White failed to include the following from this section of the Preface.

*“Also the adversaries of Judah and Jerusalem, like Sanballat in Nehemiah, mock, as we hear, both the work and the workmen, saying; “What do these weak Jews, etc.” [Neh. 4:3] Was their Translation good before? Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why then was it obruded [thrust forward] to the people? Yea, why did the Catholics (meaning Popish Romanists) always go in jeopardy, for refusing to go to hear it? Nay, if it must be translated into English, Catholics are fittest to do it. They have learning, and they know when a thing is well, they can manum de tabula [finish the picture, or work].”*

The “*same arguments*” to which White refers are evidently from papist sympathisers about whom the translators warned in their *Epistle Dedicatory*, when they spoke of being “*traded by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God’s holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people.*”

Bible believers have rightly criticised the NIV, NASV committees because they are the modern equivalent of the “*adversaries of Judah and Jerusalem,*” having produced *Catholic* bibles<sup>8 p 210-11, 258-61</sup> that repeatedly follow the Jerusalem Bible and the Douay Rheims, where these depart from the AV1611. See also the **Appendix Tables A1-A12**.

White then asserts that “*Some KJV Only advocates actually go so far as to deny the existence of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament prior to the time of Christ. The KJV translators didn’t see it that way.*” An extract from the Preface follows, in support of a pre-Christian Septuagint, or LXX.

The King James translators “*didn’t see it [the LXX] that way*” because, on this occasion, they saw wrongly. Brenton’s LXX<sup>41</sup> consists of Codex B Vaticanus, supplemented by Codex A Alexandrinus, for the parts of the Old Testament that Vaticanus omits<sup>8 p 7</sup>. Brenton makes no reference to any pre-Christian ancestors of Codices A and B and Dr Ruckman has refuted the alleged existence of a pre-Christian LXX in his detailed work, *The Mythological Septuagint*. See also Daniels<sup>43 p 47ff</sup>, Dr Gipp<sup>31 p 45ff</sup> and Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>96 p 76-9</sup>.

White continues. “*Likewise the KJV translators had a very different view of the use of the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible.*” Another extract from the Preface<sup>26</sup> follows, including the statement, “*These tongues therefore, the Scriptures we say in those tongues, we set before us to translate, being the tongues wherein God was pleased to speak to his Church by the Prophets and Apostles.*” That is, the “*original tongues*” of the Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament manuscripts.

White fails to explain what he means by “*a very different view of the use of the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible.*” Bible believers do not dispute that Hebrew and Greek – and Aramaic (parts of Daniel, Ezra and Jeremiah 10:11) are the “*original tongues*” of the scriptures but the extract that White alludes to does *not* demonstrate that any bible be-

liever has to resort to the Hebrew and Greek sources in order to determine the actual words of God.

Such a false notion is diametrically opposed to the translators' overriding objective, as Dr Smith states further in the Preface<sup>26</sup>, "*We desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar*" i.e. not restricted to the understanding of specialist, linguistic scholars.

Further on, White insists that<sup>3 p 76-7</sup> "*The translators defended their inclusion of...alternative translations or marginal readings in the KJV...and in so doing demonstrated that those who would make their translation an inerrant and inspired work do so against their own statements...When the very Preface to the KJV says "variety of Translations is profitable to the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures," it is obvious that the KJV Only position is proven utterly ahistorical [and] requires the translation to be something its own authors never intended it to be.*" A lengthy extract follows, from which appropriate selections will again be made.

On the contrary, it is James White who has attempted to distort the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible into "*something its own authors never intended it to be,*" including the principal Author – God<sup>8 General Introduction</sup>.

White quotes as follows from the Preface<sup>26</sup> with respect to "*alternative translations and marginal readings.*"

*"Some peradventure would have no variety of senses to be set in the margin, lest the authority of the Scriptures for deciding of controversies by that show of uncertainty, should somewhat be shaken. But we hold their judgment not to be sound in this point."*

White adds this part of the Preface with emphasis.

*"For as it is a fault of incredulity, to doubt of those things that are evident: so to determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the judgment of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption. Therefore as S. Augustine saith, that variety of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures."*

Dr Holland answers White as follows<sup>4</sup>.

*"White also has a series of quotes from the original preface to the KJV written by one of the translators, Dr. Miles Smith. It would be rather tedious to examine all the quotes, most of which prove nothing or are taken out of context. For example, White seems to think the translators of the KJV favored the need for additional translations and therefore would welcome modern versions (p. 76). It is true the translators stated a "variety of translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the scriptures."*

*"But this statement must be placed in its context. In marginal notes, expandatory definitions would be profitable. At the time the average reader owned few books, if any, and did not have access to the great wealth of study Bibles we have today. Marginal notes explaining words would make the use of the text that much more "profitable."*

*"The translators would not accept the readings of modern versions. They had English translations based on the same type of textural readings of modern versions in the Catholic (Douay) Bible. The translators wrote "...and all is sound for substance in one or the other of our editions, and the worst of ours (that is before 1611) is better than their authentic vulgar.""*

Cloud<sup>6 Part 3</sup> also refutes White's notion that the King James translators' marginal notes were a call for further bible translations.

**“WHITE MAKES AN ISSUE OF THE MARGINAL READINGS OF THE ORIGINAL KING JAMES BIBLE.**

*“White notes that the 1611 KJV contained 6,637 marginal notes in the Old Testament and 767 in the New. He then says, “The importance of the marginal notes to the KJV Only controversy should not be overlooked” (p. 77). He implies that it is inconsistent for King James Bible defenders to make something of the critical textual notes in the modern versions while ignoring the ones in the original KJV. This is a comparison of monkeys and apples, though. Both the 1611 KJV and the modern versions have marginal notes, but the nature of those notes is very different.*

*“First of all, the marginal notes in the modern versions ARE DIFFERENT IN CHARACTER. The textual notes in the 1611 KJV were not critical or deceitful as are the ones in the modern versions. The marginal notes in the 1611 KJV did not cast continual doubt upon the text, as do those in the modern versions. Consider, for example, the marginal note at 1 Timothy 3:16 in the NIV: “Some manuscripts God.” This is a deception, and those who read this note are led to believe a lie. The fact is that the vast majority of Greek manuscripts have the word “God” in this verse, and only a handful of very undependable ones omit it...James White, though, pretends that the marginal notes in the 1611 KJV are the same in nature as those of the modern versions and that the “King James Only” crowd is again proven inconsistent.*

*“Second, the marginal notes in the modern versions ARE DIFFERENT IN QUANTITY. James White admits that only 37 of the marginal notes in the KJV New Testament relate to variant textual readings. Even this number is inflated. Allan MacRae and Robert Newman (who are not defenders of the KJV), in their *Facts on the Textus Receptus and the King James Version* (Hatfield, PA: Biblical School of Theology, 1975), cite 13 marginal notes of variant texts in the KJV. Dr. Donald Waite, in his research into this matter, found only 11 examples of KJV N.T. marginal notes which had anything to do with variant readings...*

*“In contrast, the NIV New Testament has 120 variant footnotes, the NASV New Testament has 133, and the NKJV New Testament has 772 (Dr. Kirk D. DiVietro, *Why Not the King James Bible!*, Bible for Today, 1995, p. 22). Furthermore, many of the marginal notes in the modern versions question entire verses and passages, not just isolated words.”*

Dr Moorman adds<sup>89</sup> in his refutation of White ally Daniel Wallace these comments, which apply equally to James White.

*“Wallace says of the AV translators: “These scholars, who admitted that their work was provisional and not final (as can be seen by their preface and by their more than 8000 marginal notes indicating alternate renderings), would wholeheartedly welcome the great finds in MSS that have occurred in the past one hundred and fifty years.”*

*“In neither *The Dedication to the King*, nor *The Translators to the Reader* do I find an inference where the AV translators “admitted that their work was provisional”. To the King they declare: “out of the Original Sacred Tongues...there should be one more exact translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue”. And, to the Reader they write: “Truly, good Christian Reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principle good one, not justly to be accepted against.” (pp. xv, xvi). Wallace calls their work provisional; the AV translators say it is one principle good one.*



*“Regarding marginal readings, these provided a kind of miniature commentary. In the comparatively few places where we find them, those translators who trusted in Him that hath the key of David (Translators to the Reader, p. xvi), showed by inclusion in the text what their decision had been, while at the same time giving insight into what the Original was capable of expressing. In some cases they show a strictly literal rendering which to translate directly into English would have been awkward.*

*“In only 104 instances (Scrivener) is a variant reading from different manuscripts given. Here they show their awareness, but not to the point of distracting the reader, and certainly not to the point of Wallace’s claim that the AV translators would have “welcomed the great finds in MSS that have occurred in the last 150 years”. Erasmus’ knowledge of variant readings in Codex B is well documented. In an attempt to persuade Erasmus of the superiority of B, 365 variant readings were sent to him in early November 1533 from Rome by the Spaniard Sepulveda (Maynard, pp. 87,88). Erasmus rejected these for his 1535 edition. They were rejected by succeeding editors of the Received Text, and by the great Reformation Bibles both in English and other languages. The men of the AV knew where the dangers lurked in the manuscript record. For example, Codex D, and the Clementine Vulgate (a much more corrupt 1592 replacement for the Sixtine edition), were at their disposal. They had the spiritual discernment to reject the corrupt variants that these and other sources presented.”*

And they had more spiritual discernment than James White, Daniel Wallace, Doug Kutilek etc.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger points out, Dr Smith’s explanation<sup>26</sup> for marginal notes was that *“it hath pleased God in his divine providence, here and there to scatter words and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concern salvation, (for in such it hath been vouched that the Scriptures are plain) but in matters of less moment, that fearfulness would better beseem us than confidence, and if we will resolve upon modesty with S. Augustine... “it is better to make doubt of those things which are secret, than to strive about those things that are uncertain.””*

Dr Smith’s statement demonstrates that the King James translators sought to **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** Romans 12:17b in those few instances where they believed that the passage would admit of a *“variety of Translations”* in addition to that which they placed in the Text, having<sup>26</sup> *“at length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see.”* White himself<sup>3 p 75</sup> quotes this portion of the Preface but overlooks its import.

Dr Mrs Riplinger did not.

To cite again her pertinent observation<sup>39 p 560ff</sup> *““Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did not see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, except this word or that word...’”*

The King’s men were not advocating by means of marginal notes that *“the work of translation is never wholly finished”* as the NIV committee deceitfully does and as White tries to imply, with equal duplicity. They were not, as Cloud and Moorman show, impugning any part of their Text or leaving it open for future alteration or deletion, as the modern version editors slyly do. They were placing on record different, though valid, renderings of particular passages that would support, or help explain, not subvert, that which they had inserted into the Text *primus inter pares*, first among equals.

The last 400 years have vindicated their strategy. Not one marginal reading has ever displaced the equivalent reading of the Text in that time. The 1611 Authorised Holy Bible is “inerrant,” it is “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**” 2 Timothy 3:16, “without admixture or error”<sup>34</sup> and it is what “its own authors...intended it to be.”

The Principal Author being God.

It is “ahistorical” for James White to pretend otherwise.

But again he attacks bible believers for alleged ‘inconsistency,’ by means of marginal notes. He complains<sup>3 p 77</sup> “At Luke 17:36 a marginal note is attached that reads, “This 36. verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies”...At Acts 25:6 the marginal note reads, “Or, as some copies read, no more than eight or ten days.” KJV Only works are filled with attacks upon the modern translations for noting that certain verses are not found in ancient manuscripts [no examples given], or that some manuscripts read differently [no examples given], yet you will search in vain for the same kind of denunciation of the KJV’s textual notes.”

Why should these “textual notes” be denounced? They simply summarised the manuscript evidence with respect to the variants of the readings they inserted into the Text. This is more than can be said of the NIV translators, who omitted significant portions of some verses without any footnote e.g. 1 Peter 4:14, where the NIV along with the RV, DR, JB, NWT omits “**on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified**” and 1 John 5:13, where the NIV omits “**and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God**” along with the RV, DR, JB, NWT.

See above for the evidence in support of Luke 17:36, giving “decisive” reasons of variety, respectability, antiquity and indeed number - for at least 40 cursives *do* include the verse – for inclusion of the verse in the Text. The King James translators were simply noting an exceptional case where a reading did not have the support of the majority of the Greek manuscripts, so far as they knew.

Note that the marginal reading of Acts 25:6 is that of the *texts* of the NIV, DR, JR, JB, NWT – see **Appendix 1 Table A1** – and the NASV and RV. It is also the reading of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> and Nestle. The preponderance of the marginal reading in the essentially Catholic texts explains why, although they noted the variant’s existence, the King James translators rightly rejected it in favour of the reading “**more than ten days**” that stands in the Text now and has done since 1611.

Dr Ruckman has this comment<sup>88 p 686-7</sup>.

“The original reading [“no more than eight or ten days”]...will be found in the official Jesuit Bible (1582) of the Roman Catholic Church...[and] the Latin Vulgate. The King James translators of 1611 had the text of the New ASV on their tables when they rejected it...Vaticanus and Alexandrinus read with the Pope here, and both manuscripts’ readings were rejected in 1611 by translators who did have access to them...They had [Vaticanus and Sinaiticus readings (330-350 AD)] in the Jesuit Bible of 1582 which was in circulation more than 20 years before they began to translate.”

In contrast to the relatively few textual notes in the AV1611 on “matters of less moment,” Salliby<sup>61 p 70-4</sup> notes that in the four Gospels alone, “at least ninety...footnotes...have either contradicted or denied some Scriptural truth” and states that almost 150 such footnotes exist in the NIV New Testament – 30 more than Cloud indicates above, although these two writers may have been examining different editions of the NIV. Whichever to-

tal is the more precise, as Salliby observes, “*the NIV makes today’s Bible look like a blundering effort to piece together what is hopefully left of the Word of God.*”

Salliby lists 18 New Testament passages where NIV footnotes cast doubt on important doctrines including salvation and the Person and Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. These passages are Matthew 12:47, 16:2-3, 18, 21:44, 27:54, Mark 1:1, 15:39, 16:9-20, Luke 22:43-44, 23:34, John 7:8, 7:53-8:11, 10:9, 29, Acts 7:46, 20:28, Romans 9:5, 1 Corinthians 16:24.

See the **Appendix, Table A13** for a list of the AV1611 readings for these verses, together with the NIV footnotes.

The import of the NIV footnotes can be appreciated from some of Salliby’s comments, for example.

*“In Mark 1:1, where Jesus is called “the Son of God,” the footnote makes this title highly questionable...*

*“In John 10:29...the footnote’s alternative reads: “What my Father has given me is greater than all.” Since, in this passage, the Christians are the ones God gave to Jesus the footnote would suggest that Christians are greater than all...*

*“Regarding Acts 20:28...the footnote takes issue with the strong expression “of God” by informing the reader that it could have been worded “of the Lord” instead...*

*“...in John 7:8...the footnote suggests that the word “yet” does not belong in the text – when, obviously, the absence of this word would have meant Christ lied...*

*“Christ’s matchless prayer of love that He prayed from the cross in Luke 23:34...the footnote implies does not belong in the Bible either...*

*“In Matthew 16:18...one would suppose that if the authors of the NIV were going to make any comment on the verse at all, they would have given us the standard Protestant interpretation...Instead, they did the opposite. Their footnote reads: “Peter means rock,” and after that, it has no more to say – leaving the novice to conclude that Peter is the rock that Christ will build His Church upon. Which, of course, all conforms well with the heresy long held by the Roman Catholic Church that Peter is this rock and also their first Pope. Therefore, they believe that Rome holds the exclusive rights to the religion of Christ...*

*“For the wording in Romans 9:5...the footnote offers two alternative readings, both of which remove the Deity of Christ from the verse entirely...*

*“When the centurion confessed in Mark 15:39 that Jesus “was the Son of God,” the footnote suggests that the words “the Son,” could have been “a son.” The same footnote is found in Matt. 27:54. Needless to say, such fumbling with the truth neither enhances the student’s reading of the Bible, nor edifies their life in the least...”*

No such marginal notes exist in the AV1611 for any of the examples that Salliby gives. White is again guilty of trying to sustain “**a false balance**” Proverbs 11:1a.

But the main criticism of the NIV and other modern versions that is found in bible believing works is the omission or alteration of the scriptures in the *texts* of the new versions<sup>19 p 31ff, 20, 61 p 3ff</sup>

This is often played down by new version supporters by means of the 97%-3% thesis, namely that overall, doubts exist over only a small percentage of scriptures. See White’s

attempts to justify the “98.33 percent pure” text in the previous chapter, from which the remarks of J. Coad<sup>8 p 106</sup> are worth reproducing.

*“Is it true that there is only a 3% difference...? Yes! It is true. And that 3% makes all the difference! It is “the jam in the sandwich!” It means, for certain, that 17 complete verses belong to the New Testament, as in the Received Text (AV) or otherwise they don’t, as in the NIV. It means, again, the 147 part verses missing from the NIV should be missing - or they should not be missing. It means that a certain 169 names of Our Lord God, retained in the AV are correct, or that they should be omitted, as in the NIV! It means that the words “**The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost**” was either spoken by the Saviour Himself, as recorded in the AV (Matt. 18:11) or otherwise were not spoken by Him, as is missing in the NIV!*

*“Yet wait...consider these NIV 3% short measures. They are not short measures of any secular book out of Egypt. They are part of the sacred measures of the “**Shekel of the Sanctuary**”!...we demand full measure after “**the Shekel of the Sanctuary**”! A 97% salvation is no salvation, and a 97% Bible is not God’s Book. It has no place in the Sanctuary!”*

J. Coad’s remarks will apply equally to White’s on-going attempts to justify the mutilation of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible by modern version editors and their supporters.

Rev David Blunt, minister of the Free Church of Scotland (continuing) agrees<sup>97 p 23-4</sup>.

*“Oh, the subtlety of Satan!...the devil seeks to alter the Word of God...An important example is the conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer in Matthew 6:13: “For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen!”*

*“What encouragement to pray the disciples must have received when they heard from the lips of their Lord these words of praise and confidence – words that they were to make their own in prayer! And those who would use modern versions are robbed of them!*

*“To be consistent those who believe the modern versions to be superior should remove the final question and answer from the Westminster Shorter Catechism! (What doth the conclusion of the Lord’s prayer teach us?) We wonder why this is not done? Is it because inwardly they know that this clause is genuine and they tremble at the warnings in Scripture not to take away words from the Word of God (Revelation 22:19)?”*

White also attacks<sup>3 p 252-3</sup> Matthew 6:13, to be discussed later. However, in doing so and following his gnat-straining at marginal notes in the AV1611, he fails to address any of the serious implications that Rev Blunt and Chick Salliby raise, with respect to the footnotes, omissions and alterations found in the NIV.

White concludes this chapter resorting to another well-known attack<sup>3 p 78ff</sup> on the AV1611, that of differences between editions, including inadvertent differences arising from typographical errors.

‘Our critic’ also resorted to this kind of attack<sup>8 p 35-6, 225ff</sup>. It appears to be a favourite tactic amongst the modern counterparts of Jannes and Jambres, who today “**also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith**” 2 Timothy 3:7b.

See the **Appendix, Table A14** for the differences cited by White, compared to readings from a contemporary AV1611 and both the *Oxford Reprint of the [First] 1611 Edition* and the *First Edition\* Photographic Reproduction of the Original 1611 King James New Testament*.

\*Two printings of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible were carried out in 1611<sup>25 p 135</sup>. Printing was a laborious process in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and misprints easily occurred although the King's printers commendably achieved a text with, on average, only one error every ten pages<sup>25 p 135</sup>. Unfortunately, when errors located in one edition were corrected in a later edition, more errors could be introduced in that edition and the printed text of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible was not finalised until the publication of Dr Blayney's 1769 Oxford Edition – see comments above on the “*settled condition*” of the AV1611 Text - as acknowledged by Dr Scrivener\*\*. Nevertheless, as Dr Grady reveals<sup>8 p 204</sup>, “*over 72 percent of the textual variations were already cleared up by 1638,*” thanks in large part to the diligent efforts of two of the original translators of 1611<sup>98 p 168ff</sup>, “*such living legends as Dr John Bois and Dr Samuel Ward.*” James White's attempts to subvert bible belief by means of the differences between various editions of the AV1611 should therefore be interpreted in the light of these comments.

\*\*A few misprints occurred in individual editions after 1769. See *Appendix Table A14*.

White describes the typographical errors as “*slightly amusing*” and “*intriguing,*” including the omission of “*not*” from the Seventh Commandment in Exodus 20:14, in one edition, which therefore became known as “*The Wicked Bible.*”

The King's printers, Barker and Lucas, who printed the original 1611 Edition, printed this edition at Blackfriars in 1631<sup>99 p 106ff</sup>. They were fined £300 for their oversight and their business was effectively ruined. Worse recriminations followed for printers of King Charles I's reign, who produced an edition that came to be known as *The Fool Bible*, because it substituted “*a*” for “*no*” in Psalm 14:1 and read “*The fool hath said in his heart there is a God.*” Brewer<sup>99 p 107</sup> states, “*The printers were fined £3,000 and all copies were suppressed.*”

Although misprints in later editions were not punished with like severity, one wonders nevertheless what will eventually happen to White and others, who wilfully remove entire verses from the scriptures, diminish or weaken scores of others and “*feign themselves just men*” in so doing, Luke 20:20.

The 12 misprints that White cites are found in random editions published between the First Edition of 1611 and the contemporary Cambridge Cameo Edition. Apart from the misprints and some differences in spelling, the earliest and latest AV1611s read the same in all 12 passages. No significant textual changes are involved and White is gnat-straining.

Of the 8 revised readings to which White draws attention, only 3 give rise to an appreciable change of meaning; 1611 versus contemporary Cambridge Cameo; Psalm 69:32 with “*seeke good*” versus “*seek God,*” Jeremiah 49:1 “*inherit God*” versus “*inherit Gad,*” 1 Corinthians 4:9\* “*aproued*” versus “*appointed.*”

\*An oversight occurred in this author's previous work<sup>8 p 235-6</sup>, where 1 Corinthians 4:4 appears to have been consulted, instead of verse 9. Apologies are extended to the reader for any confusion.

Dr David F. Reagan, pastor of Trinity Baptist Temple, Knoxville, Tennessee, has produced what other bible-believing authors<sup>31 p 14ff, 39 p 600ff, 98 p 170</sup> have acknowledged as a definitive pamphlet on the different editions of the AV1611 entitled *The Myth of Revision*.

Dr Reagan notes that, “*Dr F. H. A. Scrivener...lists the variations between the 1611 edition of the KJV and later printings.*” Scrivener included in this list the date of the change

to the printed 1611 Text. The reading in Psalm 69:32, for example, was changed in 1617. Reagan believes that this change was made for typographical reasons and this is the most likely explanation for the other two changes listed above, given the similarity of the words in question. (Inspection of Acts 2:22, 23 indicates that the 1611 reading could stand in 1 Corinthians 4:9, because Paul exhorted his readers in the same letter **“Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ”** 1 Corinthians 11:1 but the later reading has the stronger association with the suffering saints **“appointed to death”** Psalm 44:11, 79:11, 102:20. That may be one reason why the later reading stands to this day.)

Another notable change, although not affecting meaning, was that of **“the Sonne”** to **“the Son of God”** realised in the Cambridge Edition of 1638<sup>100 p 46-7</sup>, overseen by Drs Bois and Ward. 3 of the other 4 examples that White lists, i.e. Deuteronomy 28:1, Joshua 13:29, Matthew 16:16, reflect similar changes that make the reading more explicit but do not alter its meaning. The 4<sup>th</sup> example, Mark 10:18, has **“no man good,”** in the 1611 Edition versus **“none good”** in a contemporary edition. Inspection of these differences suggests that they all stem from early typesetting oversights but none of them affect meaning.

The change in Mark 10:18 demonstrates **“the wisdom of...a greater than Solomon is here”** Luke 11:31 because although the 1611 reading is correct<sup>8 p 234</sup>, the later reading excludes all possibility of Catholic competition from **“the queen of heaven”** Jeremiah 7:18, 44:17, 18, 19, 25, also known<sup>15 p 16ff</sup> as **“Diana of the Ephesians”** Acts 19:27, 28, 34, 35 and as<sup>88 p 572-6, 101 p 379ff, 464ff</sup> **“BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH”** Revelation 17:1-5.

White lists a further 3 examples of differences between modern editions of the AV1611; Ruth 3:15, Jeremiah 34:16 and Matthew 4:2. Matthew 4:2 displays only differences in spelling and reads the same in both the 1611 Edition and the contemporary Cambridge Edition.

Of Ruth 3:15, Dr Ruckman states<sup>8 p 35, 102 p 14</sup>, his emphasis, **““She went into the city” has been corrected from “He went into the city” (Ruth 3:15) [as found in the 1611 AV1611], which constituted no error for both of them went into the city, which is perfectly apparent to anyone who can read two-syllable words. (The silly faculty members...who emphasize this discrepancy simply fail to read the context of the passage.)”**

White has failed to read the context as well. **“The dispute”** to which he refers<sup>3 p 80</sup> **“about how this passage should read”** that evidently **“continues to this day”** is a non-problem for a bible believer.

Dr Ruckman has some explanatory comments about Jeremiah 34:16<sup>2</sup>. See below. They are sufficient for a bible believer - though not for James White. He insists that because the different readings are still found in different editions of the AV1611, **“The person who does not make the KJV the absolute authority...has an easy answer; look at the Hebrew text and find out...[and] the Hebrew is plural here...the correct translation is the plural “you,” i.e. “ye,” which is, in fact, the reading found in the AV 1611.”**

But only because **“the Hebrew is plural here.”** According to White **“if we make the KJV the starting point (and this is exactly what radical KJV Onlyism does) there is simply no way of determining the correct text of Jeremiah 34:16.”** He declares<sup>3 p 81</sup> the reading **“he”** to be the error of **“a later English stylist [that]...somehow got past the final editing process and into print”** but expresses his dismay on discovering that the NKJV also says **“he”** in Jeremiah 34:16. However, after consultation with Dr James Price of the NKJV committee, White<sup>3 p 89</sup> assures his readers that **“Future editions of the NKJV will change the pronoun back to “you.””**

Dr Ruckman responds as follows, his emphasis.

*“White is worried about the fact that the Cambridge and Oxford editions of the AV don’t match word for word...[White] even consulted Dr James Price (on the NKJV committee...) to get back to the “original text”...They both agreed the text should say “ye” instead of “he””...*

*“Both apostates (Price and White) insisted that the plural “ye” should be maintained because “he,” being singular, was false. Whereupon they changes the “ye”...to “you.” But “you” in [modern] English, is not plural necessarily...[Greek and Hebrew] both have a plural form of “you” [but] Modern English does not preserve this distinction...*

*“BOTH variants in the AV (Jer. 34:16) were correct grammatically, if one deals with the English text or the Hebrew text. They (“ye” in the Cambridge) were being addressed as a group (plural, Jer. 34:13; as in Deut. 29), but the address was aimed at individual men (“he” in the Oxford edition), within the group. Either word would have been absolutely correct according to that great critic of critics, the word of God (Heb. 4:12-13)...*

*“No “editor” let anything slip by. White and Price think they are careful “editors.” The translators chose two different ways of saying the same thing, and both of them accorded with the context of the verse, and both of them told the TRUTH. But because they weren’t identical (Cambridge “ye,” Oxford “he”) the old self-righteous, practical atheists – no Alexandrian has any higher authority than his opinions or the opinions of his friends – claimed “error.””*

And once again, White’s claim is shown to be false.

***“He taketh the wise in their own craftiness: and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong”*** Job 5:13.

White refers to Dr Scrivener’s collation of changes in the various editions of the AV1611 but he fails to mention the dates of the changes. Perhaps this is because, like the above examples, they were among the 72% of all textual variants that were finalised under the ministry of Drs Bois and Ward by 1638. Such an early date for the resolution of almost three-quarters of all such variants – and<sup>98 p 170</sup> *“Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention”* – effectively cripples White’s insistence<sup>3 p 79</sup> that *“these changes...represent a sticky problem for the radical proponent of KJV Onlyism...when the KJV is made the absolute standard...once a person has invested the English translation with inspiration itself.”*

Dr Grady<sup>8 p 227-8</sup> also refutes White’s half-truth<sup>3 p 78</sup> that *“Editions with changes in the text came out as soon as 1612, [others] in 1613...1616, 1629, and 1638”* and his allusion to William Kilburne’s claim in 1659 that *“20,000 errors had crept into six different editions [of the AV1611] in the 1650s.”* Dr Grady states.

*“When all else fails, detractors of the King James Bible will invariably ask their despised opponents, “WHICH Authorised Version do you believe, the 1611, 1613, 1767 or perhaps the 1850?” And while their bewildered victims are pondering this troublesome innuendo (analogous to such nonsense as “Have you quit beating your wife lately?”), they are subjected to an array of staggering statistics. Citing the Evangelical scholar Jack Lewis [also cited by White], Keylock quotes him as stating:*

*““Few people realise, for example, that thousands of textual errors have been found in the KJV. As early as 1659 William Kilburne found 20,000 errors in six KJV editions.”*

*“Reckless statements such as Lewis’ are incredibly misleading as the extent of these so-called “errors” are never explained to be primarily lithographical (printing) and orthographical (spelling) in nature. In 1611, the art of printing was an occupation of the utmost drudgery. With every character being set by hand, a multitude of typographical errors was to be expected...*

*“In addition to printing flaws, there was a continual change in spelling for which to care. Lewis did not inform his readers that there was no such thing as proper spelling in the seventeenth century...*

*“A significant portion of these twenty thousand “textual errors” were in reality nothing more than changing “darke” to “dark” or “rann” to “ran.” Who but a Nicolataine priest [like James White] would categorize as serious revisions the normal follow-up corrections of mistakes at the press?*

*“It is impossible to overstate the duplicity of such critics who would weaken the faith of some with their preposterous reports of tens of thousands of errors in the Authorised Version...In his Appendix A (List of wrong readings of the Bible of 1611 amended in later editions) of his informative work, *The Authorised Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Scrivener catalogued but a fraction of the inflated figures of modern scholarship.*

*“Excluding marginal alterations and Apocrypha citings, this author has personally reviewed pages 147-194 and counted LESS THAN 800 CORRECTIONS. And even this figure is misleading when you consider that many of the instances were repetitious in nature. (Six such changes involved the corrected spelling of “Nathanael” from the 1611’s “Nathaneel” in John 1:45-49 and 21:2).*

*“Whereas Geisler and Nix cited Goodspeed’s denouncing of Dr. Blayney’s 1769 Oxford edition for deviating from the Authorised Version in “at least 75,000 details,” Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention.”*

The “sticky problem” exists only in the convoluted thought processes of James White and his fellow travellers. Clearly God worked with faithful, bible-believing editors such as Drs Bois and Ward to refine his Book just as He had summoned the scholarly King’s men to translate it in the first place. God was the Principal Editor as well as the Principal Author of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible and, as indicated earlier, the Book’s own testimony of itself, which White denies, is that it is **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16a.

White says further<sup>3 p 79</sup> that, *“the non-KJV Only believer [i.e. bible disbeliever] has recourse to Greek and Hebrew manuscripts.”*

How are these manuscripts accessed? Or does White mean ‘Greek and Hebrew editions,’ such as he mentions later<sup>3 p 81, 89?</sup> And is White implying that every child of God must become conversant with “the original tongues” or be subservient<sup>8 p 38</sup> to ‘scholars’ (like himself!) who supposedly are?

And how does the child of God reconcile the differences between manuscripts, of which many have been identified<sup>9, 11</sup> with respect to New Testament sources and which certainly exist between the Old Testament Hebrew Text and the Greek Septuagint that modern version editors often use, e.g. for the NIV<sup>NIV Preface p vii, 96 p 76, 103 p 7-8?</sup>

White fails to address any of these questions but his statement about *“recourse to Greek and Hebrew manuscripts”* certainly begs them.



(He says in his note<sup>3 p 89</sup> about the Hebrew text that “*I was using the modern text, Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.*” This is different from the text that the King James translators used, which was the Ben Chayyim Text, Bomberg Edition of 1525 but White assures his readers that the differences between the two editions “*are “microscopic,”*” according to Dr James Price – see above – who only found eight discrepancies of any significance, which he “*noted in his response to Gail Riplinger.*”

However, Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>104</sup> “*AV PUBLICATIONS offers a very old Hebrew Old Testament on CD. It is the 1524-25 Daniel Bomberg edition of the Masoretic Text based on the tradition of Jacob ben Chayyim. This edition is also known as the Second Rabbinic Bible. This CD is important for two reasons:*

- 1.) *It is probably the closest to the actual Hebrew text examined by the KJV translators.*
- 2.) *It proves the errors in the corrupt Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, from which the Old Testament of the NKJV, NIV, NASB, HCSB, ESV and all new bibles (and even current Hebrew lexicons) were translated.*”

Dr Price and James White have yet to respond to these latest comments from Dr Mrs Riplinger. Her description of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia suggests that the differences between it and the Masoretic Text are considerably more than “*microscopic.*”

Dr D. A. Waite<sup>23</sup> has informative comments on the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia in his book *Defending The King James Bible*, p 48-9, which this author has summarized in the study entitled *JDavis03*, available on request.

See also [www.arcticbeacon.com/articles/17-Dec-2007.html](http://www.arcticbeacon.com/articles/17-Dec-2007.html).

White concludes this chapter with the statement that “*The King James Version is a monument,*” i.e. not “*the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:23 because it came from “*a human process,*” that is, God was never involved in its compilation “*and God has never once promised that translations will be infallible or inerrant.*”

Naturally, White fails to discuss the translations of Acts 2<sup>39 p 621ff</sup>. This is a somewhat glaring oversight in his book.

The late Dr Frank Logsdon<sup>96 p 49-50</sup>, who was instrumental in setting up the work on the NASV together with his friend Dewey Lockman, of the Lockman Foundation and who wrote the Preface to the NASV, has this assessment of the AV1611<sup>105</sup>.

It stands in complete contradiction to that of James White.

It also stands against White’s fifth main postulate as listed in the **Summary**. See also **Introduction** and **White’s Main Postulates Refuted**. Note that although aimed specifically at the NASV, Dr Logsdon’s remarks apply equally to the NIV with respect to the opposition of these versions against the AV1611. These extracts are taken from an address that Dr Logsdon gave shortly before his death in 1987.

*“Friends, you can say the Authorized Version is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct! Because biblical correctness is predicated upon doctrinal accuracy, and not one enemy of this Book of God has ever proved a wrong doctrine in the Authorized Version. You’ve never heard of anyone’s intellect being thwarted because he believed this Authorized Version, have you? And you never will. You’ve never heard of anyone anytime going astray who embraced the precepts of the Authorized Version, and you never will...”*

*“I’m afraid I’m in trouble with the Lord, because I encouraged [Dewey Lockman] to go ahead with [the NASV]. We laid the groundwork; I wrote the format; I helped to inter-*

*view some of the translators; I sat with the translators; I wrote the preface. When you see the preface to the New American Standard, those are my words...*

*“Dr. David Otis Fuller in Grand Rapids [Michigan]. I’ve known him for 35 years, and he would say (he would call me Frank; I’d call him Duke), “Frank, what about this? You had a part in it; what about this; what about that?” And at first I thought, Now, wait a minute; let’s don’t go overboard; let’s don’t be too critical. You know how you justify yourself the last minute...*

*“But I finally got to the place where I said [to my wife], “Ann, I’m in trouble; I can’t refute these arguments; it’s wrong; it’s terribly wrong; it’s frightfully wrong; and what am I going to do about it?” Well, I went through some real soul searching for about four months, and I sat down and wrote one of the most difficult letters of my life, I think.*

*“I wrote to my friend Dewey, and I said, “Dewey, I don’t want to add to your problems,” (he had lost his wife some three years before... “but I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can’t refute them. The only thing I can do - and dear Brother, I haven’t a thing against you and I can witness at the judgment of Christ and before men wherever I go that you were 100% sincere,” (...I guess nobody pointed out some of these things to him) “I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard.”...*

*“I tell you, dear people, somebody is going to have to stand. If you must stand against everyone else, stand...”*

In conclusion, Dr Logsdon said this.

*“Let’s be people of the Book. It took my mother to heaven; and my dad, my grandfather, my grandmother. It was Moody’s Book; it was Livingstone’s Book. J. C. Studd gave up his fortune to take this Book to Africa. And I don’t feel ashamed to carry it the rest of my journey. It’s God’s Book.*

*““Our Father, we thank Thee and praise Thee for Thy Word. Help us to love it, and preach it, and teach it, and tell everybody we can the Good News through thy Word. In Jesus’ name. Amen.””*

Amen.

Note again in this chapter further examples that refute in particular White’s fifth and sixth postulates.

- The modern translations do *not* yield superior readings to the AV1611.
- The *do* attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Yet more examples will follow.

### **Chapter 5 – “The King James Only Camp”**

In this chapter White focuses<sup>3 p 91ff</sup> on the works of Drs Edward F. Hills, Gail Riplinger and Peter Ruckman, in order “to illustrate points regarding the errors made by these individuals in their writing, teaching and preaching.”

White’s first tactic is guilt by dissociation. He refers to Dean Burgon, whom he describes as a “true [scholar] of the first rank,” – a description possibly borrowed from David Otis Fuller, with reference to Benjamin Wilkinson, see **White’s Introduction** – and Burgon’s rejection of the clause “raise the dead” in Matthew 10:8, because “it was no part of His ministerial commission to them” and “it is found in those corrupt witnesses – Aleph, B, C, D and the Latin copies.” White cherry-picks this example to ‘prove’ that Burgon and other scholars of his era, Scrivener (who would not have joined the RV Committee if he had been a true bible believer) and Hoskier “were not KJV Only advocates.”

The implication is that because these scholars thought that a few changes should be made to the AV1611, the Body of Christ at the present time should discard the AV1611 for the NASV, NIV, NKJV supported by White and his cronies, especially the NASV because that will boost White’s income<sup>38</sup>. See remarks under **Chapter 3 – ‘Starting at the Beginning’**.

But Peter does raise the dead in Acts 9:36-41, even if it wasn’t part of the Lord’s immediate commission to the disciples, as does Paul. Even though he wasn’t one of the original twelve, he did manifest “truly the signs of an apostle” 2 Corinthians 12:12, including raising the dead, Acts 20:9, 10. Given that the Lord would express the full scope of His commission to the disciples, the clause *must* be included in Matthew 10:8.

Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 33</sup> has documented the sources for the clause and they are considerable, including the Tyndale, Great, Geneva and Bishops’ Bibles in addition to the Textus Receptus editions, Family 1 and 13 and cursive manuscripts N, 16, 33, 348, 372, 565, 892, 1093, 1010, 1579 and “many other mss,” besides the “corrupt witnesses” that Burgon mentioned.

Why doesn’t White discuss these relevant facts instead of simply trying to score points against bible believers?

Because he is akin to the “scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!” who “have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgement, mercy, and faith” Matthew 23:23. In fact, he is worse, because the Lord never charged the scribes and Pharisees with tampering with the Old Testament scriptures, whereas that charge certainly applies to James White.

Dr Ruckman responds to White’s comments on Burgon as follows<sup>1 p 72</sup>. Emphases are his.

*“On page 91 of White’s ridiculous tractus is the statement that Dean Burgon was a “TRUE scholar” of the “First Rank.” Whereupon Jimmy rejected everything Dean Burgon believed, taught, and stood for, after the Dean had spent five years collating White’s favorite “great Uncials” (A, B, C, Aleph, and D) in the Gospels. Dean Burgon flatly denied White’s hallucination about scribes being tempted to add before being tempted to subtract. He flatly denied Hort’s theories on “families” and a “neutral text.” He flatly denied (and ridiculed) Hort’s methods of determining an authentic “variant.” He ridiculed and disproved Hort’s hypothesis about a mythological “recension” being made at Antioch to get a “fuller text,” and he accused Hort of being a deceived, day-dreaming fool occupied with “moonshine” and excursions into “cloudland.””*

See Burgon's detailed comments on the "great Uncials," text-types, families and Westcott and Hort's theories in *Chapter 3*. Dr Ruckman continues.

*"When faced with this glaring inconsistency in his praise for a man that he would not believe or follow three feet, Jimmy's lame alibi for his switch in standards (again!) is a classic. It goes like this: "A TRUE Christian scholar"<sup>3 p 95, 247</sup> [he just named Burgon] is a lover of TRUTH."*

*"So Dean Burgon was not a true "Christian scholar"; Hort was, for White adopted all five of Hort's basic teachings."*

White later criticises Dr Ruckman but avoids discussing any of the inconsistency on his part that Dr Ruckman has raised.

White says of Dr Hills<sup>3 p 92</sup> that he "began with the conclusion of his argument ("the TR is the God-preserved text") and did not hesitate to utilize the conclusion in the course of his argument, charges of circularity notwithstanding."

White cites Dr Hills in part as follows<sup>65 p 224-5</sup>.

*"God's preservation of the New Testament text was not miraculous but providential. The scribes and printers who produced the copies of the New Testament Scriptures and the true believers who read and cherished them were not inspired but God-guided. Hence there are some New Testament passages in which the true reading cannot be determined with absolute certainty...in some of the cases in which the Textus Receptus disagrees with the Traditional Text it is hard to decide which text to follow. Also, as we have seen, sometimes the several editions of the Textus Receptus differ from each other and from the King James Version..."*

*"In short, unless we follow the logic of faith, we can be certain of nothing concerning the Bible and its text. For example, if we make the Bodmer and Chester Beatty Papyri our chief reliance, how do we know that even older New Testament papyri of an entirely different character have not been destroyed by the recent damming of the Nile and the consequent flooding of the Egyptian sands?"*

White adds a note<sup>3 p 122</sup> on Dr Hills's statement above as follows.

*"Dr Hills' argument is self-refuting. If we accept his constant use of the "providence of God," we cannot help but point out that if other NT manuscripts were destroyed by the flooding of the Nile, was this not as well under the guiding hand of the providence of God? Such arguments cut in both directions."*

White's note is misleading.

Dr Hills is giving a hypothetical example of the non-providence of God and the absence of God's guiding hand, which 'logically' stems from what Dr Hills terms "the logic of unbelief," i.e. the rejection of "the logic of faith," which logic is of course not "circular" as White insists above but *scriptural*. See remarks in **Introduction, White's Main Postulates Refuted** and comments in the previous chapter on the AV1611 readings in Revelation that White disputes and on 1 John 5:7.

Moreover, White has omitted Dr Hills's intervening paragraphs – while blaming Gail Riplinger a few pages further on for taking quotes out of context - in which Dr Hills explains the consequences of rejecting "the logic of faith," in favour of "the logic of unbelief," succinctly expressed by the Philistines in 1 Samuel 6:9b, "*it was a chance that happened to us.*"

These paragraphs read as follows, Dr Hills's emphases.

*"In other words, God does not reveal every truth with equal clarity. In biblical textual criticism, as in every other department of knowledge, there are still some details in regard to which we must be content to remain uncertain. But the special providence of God has kept these uncertainties down to a **minimum**. Hence if we believe in the special providential preservation of the Scriptures and make this the leading principle of our biblical textual criticism, we obtain **maximum certainty**, all the certainty that any mere man can obtain, all the certainty that we need. For we are led by the logic of faith to the Masoretic Hebrew text, to the New Testament Textus Receptus, and to the King James Version." (This author's underlined emphasis.)*

*"But what if we ignore the providential preservation of the Scriptures and deal with the text of the holy Bible in the same way in which we deal with the texts of other ancient books? If we do this, we are following the logic of unbelief [This author's underlined emphasis.], which leads to **maximum uncertainty**. When we handle the text of the holy Bible in this way, we are behaving as unbelievers behave. We are either denying that the providential preservation of the Scriptures is a fact, or else we are saying that it is not an important fact, not important enough to be considered when dealing with the text of the holy Bible. But if the providential preservation of the Scriptures is not important, why is the infallible inspiration of the original Scriptures important? If God has not preserved the Scriptures by His special providence, why would He have infallibly inspired them in the first place? And if it is not important that the Scriptures be regarded as infallibly inspired, why is it important to insist that Gospel is completely true? And if this is not important, why is it important to believe that Jesus is the divine Son of God?"*

White does not address, let alone answer, these questions. Dr Hills's comments reveal that he is putting forward the Text of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible as the text of "maximum certainty." Even if he thought that some New Testament passages could not be known "with absolute certainty," he is nevertheless affirming that these readings should stand as they are found in the AV1611. He is *not* advocating that they should be changed, or updated or deleted and puts forward<sup>65 p 218-220</sup> several reasons for his stance in this respect, which White conveniently ignored.

White then launches into a discussion<sup>3 p 94-5</sup> of "absolute certainty," which was *not* the essential point of Dr Hills's remarks – see above.

Nevertheless, White declares that, "Protestants...should be quick to question any such notion of absolute religious certainty."

To reinforce his attempts to sow doubt about the Text of the AV1611, White alludes once again to the statement found in the Preface to the AV1611<sup>26</sup>, discussed in the previous chapter, "For as it is a fault of incredulity, to doubt of those things that are evident: so to determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the judgment of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption."

And he insists that, "Those who offer us certainty beyond all questions, the translators would rightly say, are being presumptuous with God's truth. Those who offer absolute certainty do so at a cost: individual responsibility."

White in effect gravitates to what Dr Hills referred to as "maximum uncertainty." He insists that bible believers, "without any factual or logical or even scriptural reason for doing so," have invested "the KJV translators with ultimate authority" and concludes that, "This is...what KJV Only advocates are doing when they close their eyes to the historical realities regarding the biblical text."

Concerning Protestants and “*absolute religious certainty*,” White is overwhelmingly certain that he should change the AV1611 to match the NIV and other modern versions including the JB and NWT in over 200 passages of scripture. See *Appendix, Tables A1-A4*.

So his remark above is somewhat inconsistent and indicative of a double standard.

Concerning his allusion to the Preface of the AV1611, White has again wrested Dr Miles Smith’s comments out of context. See discussion in the previous chapter on marginal notes.

And recall yet again, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s pertinent observation<sup>39 p 560ff</sup> ““*Seven*” times “*they purge...and purify it...*” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. *The KJV translators did not see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, except this word or that word...’*”

It is in fact James White who is being “*presumptuous with God’s truth*” and however White perceives “*individual responsibility*,” his own *irresponsibility* with respect to “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21, is made plain by Dr Smith’s admonition<sup>26</sup>.

“*Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews. [Gen 26:15. Jer 2:13.] Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things. Say not to our Saviour with the Gergesites, Depart out of our coast [Matt 8:34]; neither yet with Esau sell your birthright for a mess of pottage [Heb 12:16].*”

See comments earlier under *Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath* and the discussion in the previous chapter on Luke 2:14, with respect to White’s notions of “*individual responsibility*.”

White’s opinions on “*historical realities regarding the biblical text*” with respect to the editions of Erasmus, Stephanus and Beza and the work of the King James translators, have been answered in the previous chapter, which see.

White is misrepresenting bible believers when he insists that they have invested “*the KJV translators with ultimate authority*.” Bible believers ‘invest’ nothing. Instead, “*They believed the scriptures, and the word which Jesus had said*” John 2:22b.

Ultimate authority is invested in the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible itself - by its Principal Author.

“*For thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name*” Psalm 138:2b.

That declaration is the ‘historical reality.’ It is ‘factual,’ logical’ and above all ‘scriptural.’

Though comprehension of that kind of reality, history, fact, logic and scripture all in one appears to be beyond James White.

In answer to White’s attack on the “*declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us*” and on behalf of any bible believer concerning “*the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed*” Luke 1:1a, 4b, Dr Holland states<sup>4</sup>.

“[citing James White] “*Dr. Hills’ [sic] honesty is a breath of fresh air. If he had not begun with the assumption of the superiority of the TR, he would undoubtedly have been led*

to a conclusion in favor, at the very least, of the 'Majority Text' rather than the modern critical texts" (p. 93). Really? Then why did he not do so?

"By in large, these are the same old arguments those who oppose the Authorized King James Bible have always used. You can ask, "Which edition of the KJV do you have, the 1611 or the 1769?" And like White, you can cite what you view as "Problems in the KJV." This is nothing new and the question still remains unanswered, "Where is the inerrant Bible you speak of?"

"White argues that those who can answer the above question by producing a Bible which can be seen, read, and tested have become cultists looking for "absolute certainty." In fact, he compares them to Roman Catholics looking for absolute certainty in the infallibility of the Pope. He compares them to the Mormons who look for absolute certainty in the authority of the Apostles in Salt Lake City and to Jehovah's Witnesses who look for absolute certainty in the Governing Body of the Watchtower (p. 94). Strangely, all these groups would agree with White that the KJV is full of errors and they have something better. They are free to believe as they wish but truth dictates the assurance that God has kept and preserved His words. On this issue we can be absolute and certain.

"For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh in you that believe." (1 Thess. 2:13)"

It is the AV1611 "which effectually worketh in you that believe." The modern counterfeits do not, as the history of non-revival and gathering apostasy since the time of Westcott and Hort regrettably shows.

Dr Holland's stance is indeed factual, logical and scriptural. That of James White is not.

White now directs his attack<sup>3 p 95ff</sup> on Dr Mrs Riplinger and her book *New Age Bible Versions*, published in 1993, under the heading of *A Case Study in Misrepresentation*.

A title that is ironic in the extreme.

Especially when White insists that, "Christians are to be lovers of truth, and as such, should hold to the highest standards thereof." White's 'standards of truth' with respect to Gail Riplinger and her work will become apparent as his comments are examined.

His standards of truth are compromised even before he begins his detailed comments. White says<sup>3 p 97</sup> of Dr Mrs Riplinger's work that "No chance is missed to insult and attack men both living and dead, as long as they had something to do with "modern versions.""

Like White insults and attacks<sup>3 p 246</sup> King James 1<sup>st</sup>, who of course "had something to do with" the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.

"King James...was a homosexual."

A lie.

See the exhaustive, 390-page work by Stephen A. Coston Sr., entitled *King James...Unjustly Accused?* Konigswort, 1996, Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 95-69081.

See also comments by secular historian Antonia Fraser and others<sup>8 p 272</sup>, to the effect that the attacks on the character of James 1<sup>st</sup> were slanderous and sprang from a desire for revenge mainly on the part of two individuals; one a disaffected courtier and the other an agent for Mary Stuart.

White is in good company.

His first specific criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger is with respect to her comparison<sup>14 p 454-5</sup> of the AV1611 reading of Isaiah 26:3,

***“Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee”***

versus that of the NASV,

*“The steadfast of mind thou wilt keep in perfect peace, Because he trusts in thee.”*

where *New Age Versions* omits the underlined words in each reading because Dr Mrs Riplinger’s point is that the NASV has omitted the first **“on thee.”** In the context of the passage, the phrase is crucial for the believer’s peace of mind. (The NIV, DR, JB and NWT also omit the first **“on thee.”** See *Appendix, Table A1*. Again, James White is in good company, with respect to his ‘standards of truth.’)

White’s objection is as follows.

*“While New Age Bible Versions places a period after “peace,” in its rendering of the NASB, we see that no such period exists. Instead, the rest of the verse actually contains the “key words” alleged to be missing! And note that New Age Bible Versions does not indicate that the KJV uses italics for the inserted clause “on thee,” for quite simply the Hebrew does not contain the phrase! This kind of actual mis-citation appears throughout the text of the book.”*

*New Age Versions* puts a ‘period’ after **“on thee”** in the AV1611 citation of Isaiah 26:3 as well, although such a punctuation mark does not appear there in the AV1611 Text – see above – so White’s first objection is groundless. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s essential point rests solely on a comparison of the first part of the verse, which she has rightly expressed in sentence form.

Concerning the use of italics, White is displaying symptoms of what Dean Burgon<sup>8 p 174</sup> termed *“The schoolboy method of translation.”* Italics are present in the AV1611 because it is an honest translation, as discussed elsewhere<sup>8 p 29-30, 203ff</sup>.

*“The AV1611 translators inserted words in Italics which had no direct equivalents in the Hebrew or Greek texts but which were necessary for clarity, good English style and grammatical sense.”*

White is clutching at straws. Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 2</sup> responds on this point. Note that Gail Riplinger wrote this work, entitled *The King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* in response to an earlier work by White, entitled *New Age Bible Versions Refuted*<sup>3 p 122</sup>.

White<sup>3 p 123</sup> even alludes to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s book, *The King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* but has ignored its insightful admonitions. He should not ignore Proverbs 25:1.

***“He, that being often reproveth hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy.”***

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, her emphases.

*“White hopes his readers are as weak in grammar, syntax and theology as he is. He tells easily noted outright lies, which only the “simple” (Rom. 16:18) will swallow. He begins his lambast, storming:*

*““[T]he rest of the verse actually contains the ‘key words’ she alleges are missing!...This kind of actual miscitation of the modern versions is rampant throughout the text of her work.”*



*“If White can find the missing words “on thee” in that verse in his NASB, I’ll give him \$1 million dollars. He is lying, the rest of the verse does NOT “actually contain the key words she alleges are missing!” His accusations fall under the category of “false allegations” (not “fair comment”) in the courts.*

*“Was White looking out the window in grade school when sentence diagramming was presented on the board? His misunderstanding of subjects, objects, and modifiers can be seen here in his mishandling of Isaiah 26:3. The KJV presents a simple equation that, if followed, would prevent the current rush of Christians to psychiatrists. It states that **if** one’s mind is stayed on God, it will have perfect peace. It is no coincidence that psychology followed the new versions into the church. The NASB and NIV’s presentation of this verse in Isaiah is theologically wrong. They state that it is the operation of the mind (viz. focused, steadfast), and not the object of that focus, that will bring peace. Hindu meditation precisely fits the NASB criterion. One must keep his mind steadfastly fixed on the mantra; when other thoughts enter, they must be rejected. A mind that is steadfastly focused on one’s job, family, or other earthly things, will also fit the new version’s criteria - but not God’s criteria. One cannot pretend, as White does, that because the words “**in Thee**” are a part of the next subject (he), verb (trusteth), and prepositional modifier (in Thee), that they have any grammatical connection to the earlier sentence and its syntax. The KJV has **BOTH** “on thee” in part one **AND** “in thee” in part two. The NASB omits one, thereby changing the meaning. White misses, not only the grammatical differences and hence the factual differences here, but he misses the basic biblical distinction between the heart, which trusts **in** God, and the mind which thinks **on** God. The “because” phrase tells **WHY** it works; it does not tell **WHAT** works.*

*“The KJV uses italics when the theological sense of a verse demands the insertion of English words to accurately complete a Hebrew thought. It is the only translation that is honest in this way. Both the NIV and NASB insert 1000’s of words, but give the reader no clue as to which words are inserted. One NIV editor’s article “When Literal Is Not Accurate” gives expression to the frequent use (6000 in the NIV) of such insertions.*

*“The veracity of the italics in the KJV have been proven true to such a degree that this author feels no need to pick them out and set them apart as uninspired. The ten words in italics in 1John 2:23 have since been vindicated by ancient manuscript discoveries. Note the following ‘miraculous’ coincidences:*

- *The italics of Ps. 16:8 are quoted by Paul in the Greek text of Acts 2:25.*
- *The italics of Is. 65:1 are quoted by Paul in the Greek text of Rom. 10:20.*
- *The italics of Ps. 94:11 are quoted by Paul in the Greek text of 1 Cor. 3:20.*
- *The italics of Deut. 25:4 are quoted by Paul in the Greek text of 1 Cor. 9:9.*
- *The italics of Deut. 8:3 are quoted by Jesus in the Greek text of Matt. 4:4.*

*“I miscited nothing; my allegations regarding the NASB’s omission are true. White’s wrong **again**.”*

Dr Ruckman adds<sup>1 p 75-6</sup>, his emphases, “White accuses [Mrs Riplinger] of lying when she said “something had been deleted” from Isaiah 26:3 in the NASV. **It had been**. The word “**stayed**” had been omitted, and the word “**on**” had been omitted. **White lied**...”

*“A man’s **mind** has to be stayed on **God** before God will give him peace (AV, Isa. 26:3). But a Scholarship Only advocate’s mind is never **stayed on God** (see Rom. 1:21). He does not “**retain**” God in his thoughts (Rom. 1:28) so the NASV says that all a man has to*

do is have a “steadfast mind.” It doesn’t have to be stayed on ANYTHING, let alone “GOD.””

White then complains<sup>3 p 98</sup> that *New Age Versions*<sup>14 p 375-6</sup> erroneously claims that ““The KJV is the only bible\* that distinguishes between the Hebrew Adonai and the JHVH, using ‘Lord’ for the former and ‘LORD’ for the latter.”” White insists that “This is untrue. The NASB, NIV, NKJV...and others all use the “Lord/LORD” means of distinguishing between Adonai and YHWH. Even a brief glance at almost any page of the Old Testament in any of these other translations would have indicated the error of this statement.”

\*White objects<sup>3 p 122</sup> to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s use of the lower case term “bible” instead of the capitalised word “Bible” but since Dr Mrs Riplinger is simply using the generic term for the scriptures, White’s objection is unfounded.

Note White’s subtle shift from the Old Testament word “JHVH” to the unscriptural word “YHWH.” This will be discussed later.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 1</sup> responds.

“White is lying once again. Regarding the fact, stated in *New Age Bible Versions*, that the KJV is the only version which consistently distinguishes Adonai as Lord, White bleats, ““This kind of false statement is found all through *New Age Bible Versions*.”

“White whittles away at any notion that he is a researcher. *New Age Bible Versions* warned readers (pp. 375-376) that the KJV is the only Bible which consistently distinguishes between the Hebrew Adonai, as Lord, and JHVH, as LORD. White states that even if you take a “brief glance,” as he calls it, at new versions, you will find “Of course, this is simply untrue.” His “brief glance” missed the 291 times when the NIV, for example, substituted “Sovereign” for the Hebrew noun Adonai. The KJV, in all 291 of these instances, translates it “Lord.” These instances (e.g. Gen. 15:2) where Adonai JHVH appear together, the KJV retains both proper names, not inserting ‘new’ words when the Hebrew text has the names of God. (Note the introduction by the NIV of just another Calvinistic term: Sovereign.) The “false statement,” as White called it, was his, not mine.”

In addition to the erroneous reading “Sovereign” that Dr Mrs Riplinger describes, a search of “Adonai” rendered as “**Lord**” by means of Young’s *Concordance* and checked by means of *Green Hebrew English Interlinear* for the Masoretic Text, reveals that the NASV and NKJV, British Usage Edition, are in error on 12 and 20 occasions respectively, thus vindicating Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement. See *Appendix, Table A15*. A search of the usage of JHVH in the same sources may reveal yet more inconsistencies in the modern versions.

White could argue that the anomalous readings of the NASV and NKJV are relatively few in number, compared to the well-over 200 instances where “Adonai” occurs in the Hebrew Text and is correctly given as “Lord” by the modern versions. However, Solomon warns that it is “*the little foxes, that spoil the vines*” Song of Solomon 2:15b. Both the Hebrew and English Old Testaments were in “a settled condition”<sup>8 p 7</sup> by the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and whether inadvertently or otherwise, the modern versions should not be permitted to unsettle them. Exercise of this kind of liberty may seem harmless where the actual word is unchanged but it easily results in the insertion of man-made terms into the text such as “Sovereign,” which Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly criticises.

White now springs once again<sup>3 p 99ff</sup> to the defence of Westcott and Hort, alluding again<sup>3 p 122-3</sup> to the alleged criticism of the pair as “baby sprinklers.” See remarks by Wilkinson

and Cloud in the previous chapter on the real reasons why bible believers “vilify” Westcott and Hort. It is because, biblically, they were villains, like Elymas the sorcerer, rightly censured by the Apostle Paul.

***“O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?”*** Acts 13:10.

White also notes *“that Westcott and Hort correctly identified...that it is simply not enough to count manuscripts, but instead we must weigh manuscripts”* but, like our critic<sup>8 p 289-90</sup>, he covers his back with the caveat that *“modern textual criticism...has in many instances corrected imbalances in [Westcott and Hort’s] own conclusion.”*

As stated in this author’s earlier work, *“Yet our critic continues, still with the party line “Contrary to what is still believed in the KJV-only lobby modern editions of the NT are not dominated by Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Modern scholars show that they were overestimated by Westcott.”*

*“Modern scholars” have shown nothing of the kind. Burgon, Miller and Scrivener showed that BEFORE 1900. See Sections 1.6, 9.3, 9.5.*

*“Section 9.2 discusses our critic’s repeated assertion about “modern editions...not dominated by Vaticanus and Sinaiticus”, where the NIV notes were cited indicating that Aleph and B were “the most reliable early manuscripts.” It was further discussed in Section 9.3, where the MAIN sources for modern New Testaments were LISTED. It was noted there that of this list “B and Aleph...usually head it.”*

See also Moorman<sup>9</sup>, who shows that most of the 356 significant doctrinal departures of the NIV from the AV1611 that he lists are based on sources headed by Aleph and B. This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 294-7</sup> includes a summary list of 62 doctrinally important verses where the NIV departs from the AV1611. The departures in 55 of those verses, or almost 90%, rely mostly on Aleph, B or both, showing that the malign influence of these corrupt documents persists to this day.

Attention is drawn to the comments by Pickering and Burgon<sup>8 p 116, 77 p 266</sup>, their emphases.

*““Witnesses are to be weighed and not counted” is an axiom to those who work within Hort’s framework. The fallacies...are basic and need to be considered closely. How are witnesses to be weighed? This weighing has been done by Hort, etc. on the basis of subjective considerations...”*

White fails to demonstrate that the considerations of modern editors are any less subjective than those of Hort. See his remarks on Metzger’s rejection of the phrase **“by Jesus Christ”** as the ending of Ephesians 3:9 in the previous chapter and those in support of this phrase as Holy Scripture.

Burgon states.

*“The ‘witnesses are to be weighed - not counted,’ is a maxim of which we hear constantly. It may be said to embody much fundamental fallacy.*

*“It assumes that the ‘witnesses’ we possess – meaning thereby every single Codex, Version, Father - , (1) are capable of being weighed; and (2) that every individual Critic is competent to weigh them: neither of which propositions is true.*

*“In the very form of the maxim, - ‘Not to be counted **but** to be weighed,’ – the undeniable fact is overlooked that ‘number’ is the most ordinary ingredient of weight and indeed, even in matters of human testimony, is an element which cannot be cast away.”*

White professes<sup>3 p 100</sup> to be “*simply shocked by the blatant editing of the words of [Westcott and Hort] by Gail Riplinger.*” He challenges the validity of the following citation<sup>14 p 546</sup> from Westcott and Hort’s *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* on the basis that “*ellipses can be used to give a false impression.*”

“*[R]eadings of Aleph & B should be accepted as the true readings...[They] stand far above all documents...[are] very pure...excellent...and immune from corruption.*”

White then follows with four extended quotes, each entitled “*What W&H Actually Said*” encompassing the above citation in *New Age Versions* and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of “*“cut and paste”*” citations, so that<sup>3 p 102</sup> “*we can safely conclude that New Age Versions presents an unfair and unreliable view of modern scholarship.*”

Inspection of White’s extended quotes reveals the following postulations from Westcott and Hort’s *Introduction*. White fails to cite anything from Westcott and Hort to substantiate them.

1. No readings of Aleph and B “*can be rejected absolutely*” without “*“strong internal evidence...to the contrary”*” and where “*“they receive no support from Versions or Fathers.”*” White gives no examples of any readings of Aleph and B that Westcott and Hort rejected. Nor does he explain why Westcott and Hort arbitrarily dismissed the majority of Greek manuscript evidence.
2. “*“The common original of Aleph/B for by far the greater part of their identical readings...had a very ancient and very pure text.”*” Nothing is said about the overwhelmingly *non-identical* readings of Aleph and B. See remarks under ***The Revision Conspiracy***, especially by Burgon and in ***Chapter 3*** on Sinaiticus as White’s “*great treasure,*” together with that “*great codex,*” Vaticanus.
3. “*“Aleph and B...stand alone in their almost complete immunity from distinctive Syrian readings.”* Westcott and Hort contend that “*Aleph [stands] far above all documents except B,*” where its text is reckoned by them to be “*neither Western nor Alexandrian*” and “*B [stands] far above Aleph in its apparent freedom from either Western or Alexandrian readings, with the partial exception in the Pauline epistles.*” This extended quote simply reinforces the points that Wilkinson made, with respect to the revisers’ opinions on the superiority of the text of Aleph and B over that of the Traditional Text. See ***The Revision Conspiracy*** and ***Chapter 3***.

“*Hort’s partiality for the Vatican Manuscript was practically absolute.*”

“*We can almost hear him say, The Vaticanus have I loved, but the Textus Receptus have I hated.*”

4. Aleph and B are descended from “*a common parent extremely near the apostolic autographs*” or from an “*MS...of the very highest antiquity*” or from an MS the text of which “*had enjoyed a singular immunity from antiquity.*” This extended quote serves only to reinforce what Dr Mrs Riplinger writes in the context of the summary citation found in *New Age Versions*, “*Today the Greek manuscripts Aleph & B, produced under the ‘authority’ of Constantine’s Rome, attempt to hold captive those like Paul, who want to speak the word of God in the language of the people.*”

Gail Riplinger answers White’s accusations as follows<sup>7 Part 2</sup>. Emphases are hers.

“*I quoted Westcott and Hort as saying,*

““[R]eadings of Aleph and B should be accepted as true readings...[They] stand far above all documents...[are] very pure...excellent...immune from corruption.”<sup>14 p 546</sup>

“White cites this quote and concludes the following.

““Anyone reading this material would be led to believe that Westcott and Hort held a very radical view of the Greek manuscripts Aleph and B<sup>3 p 100</sup>.””

“To foster his misrepresentation, White does three things.

“1.) He ignores the words “Readings of” and pretends the descriptive adjectives (pure, excellent, et al.) refer to “the Greek manuscripts Aleph and B” not “[R]eadings of Aleph and B.” He pretends Riplinger says, “the Greek manuscripts Aleph and B,” when the quote was “[R]eadings of Aleph and B...”

“In the literature of textual criticism the phrase “readings of” ALWAYS refers to parts, that is readings in a manuscript. No one familiar with the field would mistake a quote discussing (for example) “readings of the Byzantine manuscripts having very ancient attestation” with the WHOLE of the manuscripts. If White would read my quote on page 546 AND his own expanded Westcott and Hort quote, he would find the word “READINGS” occurs seven times. If White would re-read Westcott and Hort’s Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek highlighting the word “readings” as he goes, he would have an eye opener. Page 220 alone uses the word seven times in connection with Aleph and B. The “readings” which Westcott and Hort find “identical” in Aleph and B are those “readings” which they think come from “the common original” (see your own quote [i.e. Point 2 above]).

“Having set up his straw opposition, **pretending** Riplinger is referring to “the Greek manuscripts Aleph and B,” White says<sup>3 p 101</sup>,

““Note that Westcott and Hort are not referring to Aleph/B AS **RIPLINGER INDICATES** but to the parent text.” [emphasis mine]

“Riplinger indicated no such thing and the “Readings of Aleph and B” which she discusses **are** identified by Westcott and Hort as virtually identical to the readings of the parent text. Westcott and Hort say on p. xxiv:

“**Readings of Aleph and B** are virtually readings of a lost MS above two centuries older.”

“Riplinger WAS talking about the parent!”

White inserts the following statement<sup>3 p 100</sup> in order to bolster up the notion that Gail Riplinger miscited Westcott and Hort.

“Contextually, at the top of this very page [p. 225], W & H were talking about errors in Aleph/B. One would hardly get that idea from what Riplinger wrote.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger responds as follows, her emphases.

“The “top of” a page is **not** the context. **Read the whole** section C, pp. 212-227 and you will find that, the quote is from the **last** sentence or two. As in all good English composition, it is **SUMMATIVE** and **CONCLUSIONAL**. It summarizes and concludes section C, entitled, “Origin and Character of Readings of Aleph and B Combined.” The section **predominately** points to the “exceptional purity” of their readings and only the last subsection (303) notes any errors. In fact, if White had given the whole sentence, that would be very clear. It reads, “Accordingly, with the exceptions mentioned above [White’s

phoney “context”], it is our belief (1) that readings of Aleph and B should be accepted as the true readings...”

White continues to cut and thrust at Dr Mrs Riplinger’s composite quote above from Westcott and Hort. She ripostes him each time.

White: “[T]here is nothing on page xxii [of Westcott and Hort’s Introduction] that is in Mrs. Riplinger’s quote; the sentence “With these exceptions, readings of [Aleph and B] should be accepted when not contravened by strong internal evidence” appears on page xxiv.”

GAR, her emphasis: “Have you read the manual? (*The Chicago Manual of Style* or a similar reference work on the use of footnotes.) If you had, you would know the rule that footnotes may contain “not only the source of the quotation in the text but other related material as well.” The pages listed (i.e. xxii) **if read** set a foundation for understanding Hort’s dismissal of the overwhelming evidence of the Versions and Fathers against their “best Greek MSS.” Why do you bring up p. xxiv; Riplinger doesn’t cite or quote it. But while you’re there, note how it identifies as identical your “parent text” and the “readings of Aleph and B.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger is referring to her Footnote 2<sup>14</sup> p 686 of her Chapter 39, *The 1% Manuscripts*, which lists p xxii, 225, 212, 228, 239, 210 of Westcott and Hort’s *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* as the sources for her composite quote.

White: “page 210 shows the same kind of egregious error of citation that we saw on p. 225.”

GAR, her emphasis: “The “same kind of egregious error” is YOURS. The word [They] refers back to the sentence’s SUBJECT, “readings”. Note your own quote [from p 210 of Westcott and Hort’s *Introduction*]:

““immunity from distinctive Syrian **READINGS**...freedom from either Western or Alexandrian **READINGS**.””

White: “There is nothing on page 212 which is anyway relevant to the citation given by Riplinger, unless their use of “excellence” lies behind Riplinger’s use of “excellent.”

GAR: “You...missed “the preeminent excellence of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS [Aleph and B]” or the statement that they are “found to have habitually the best readings.””

White did not quote these statements from Westcott and Hort’s p 212.

Note that White<sup>3</sup> p 97 blames Dr Mrs Riplinger for “a plethora of out-of-context quotations” but he has here conspicuously failed to give the context himself. Dr Mrs Riplinger generously does it for him.

White: “There is nothing even remotely relevant to the quotation on page 239 [from p 239 of Westcott and Hort’s *Introduction*].”

GAR, her emphasis: “Did you speed past the word “excellent,” which you **pretend** is an error coming from “excellence” on p. 212? You missed... “**readings** being shown by the respective contexts to have been actually used by Clement and both [readings] making excellent sense.” If you missed ALL of that, how did you **also** miss “The special excellence of B”?”

Answer. Because White is as ‘thick as thieves’ with those imbued with “**the sleight of men,**” who practise “**cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive**” Ephesians 4:14b.

White's next defence<sup>3 p 102</sup> is with respect to that of "Dr Edwin Palmer, the executive secretary of the NIV translation committee."

First, White accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying "to paint Dr Palmer as a...denier of the deity\* of the Lord Jesus Christ, through the misuse of his own words."

\*White uses "deity" instead of "Deity," while criticising Dr Mrs Riplinger for writing "bible" instead of "Bible." See remarks above. Again, he is being 'inconsistent' and imposing 'a double standard.'

White then quotes Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 305</sup> as follows, citing Dr Palmer's statement from *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*.

"[There are] few clear and decisive texts that declare Jesus is God."

White then inserts "What Dr Palmer Actually Said," which reads, with respect to the statement that Dr Mrs Riplinger has focussed on, "John 1:18, as inspired by the Holy Spirit, is one of those few clear and decisive texts that declare that Jesus is God."

Thus, according to James White, Dr Mrs Riplinger has "misrepresented Dr Palmer."

Gail Riplinger responds<sup>7 Part 1</sup> as follows, her emphases.

"It is easy for readers, in this busy non-reading culture, to skip over a **few** words and thoughts which are submerged in a welter of other words. To bring the views of new version editors out from hiding, I put the magnifying glass on **those words** which distil their thoughts. Palmer, for example, communicated his belief that he thinks the Bible has "FEW CLEAR AND DECISIVE **TEXTS** that declare that Jesus is God." He said this amidst this discussion of John 1:18, citing it as one of them. A Bible translator that only can find a **few** such **texts** strikes me as "chilling," to say the least. New Age Bible Versions followed Palmer's quote (p. 305) listing **hundreds** of places (pp. 302-383) which document that his NIV does have **few** compared to the **many** in the KJV.

"White **pretends** the first five words of my Palmer quote don't exist. He focuses on the 'Jesus is God' portion **pretending** in his mind that it says 'Palmer doesn't think Jesus is God,' rather than **READING** "few clear and decisive texts that declare that Jesus is God." Palmer's ideas about the deity of Christ are not the topic of my discussion, nor Palmer's quote. The subject is **texts** and their **number**."

White's next accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger is that she "claims that Edwin Palmer denies the role of the Holy Spirit in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ."

He reproduces<sup>3 p 103</sup> Palmer's statement as quoted by Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 344</sup>, "The Holy Spirit did not beget the Son" and follows it with a lengthier quote, from Palmer's book, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*, which concludes as follows.

"From all eternity, the Father begat the Son. The Holy Spirit did not beget the Son, only the Father did."

White follows this statement with a second extended quote from Palmer's book, addressing "The Incarnation," in order to show that "Palmer is fully "orthodox" with respect to the need for "The Holy Spirit...at the very start of Jesus' human life, at his\* incarnation." And Dr Mrs Riplinger has therefore misrepresented Dr Palmer again, according to White.

\*White does not see fit to take Edwin Palmer to task for using "his" instead of "His" with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ, although Gail Riplinger is to be censured for using

“*bible*” instead of “*Bible*.” Yet again, White is being ‘inconsistent’ and imposing ‘a double standard.’

Dr Mrs Riplinger replies<sup>7 Part 1</sup>, her emphases.

*“White lies again saying I claim “Palmer denies the role of the Holy Ghost in the Incarnation...” Nowhere in New Age Bible Versions do I make **any** comments at all about Palmer’s notions about the incarnation. In fact, Palmer’s quotes, seen in the book, do not mention or discuss the incarnation.*

*“New Age Bible Versions is a study in semantics (the meaning of words). It devoted several pages to an analysis of the word ‘begotten’ and ‘beget’. In trying to assess **why** the NIV would **not** fully translate the word monogenes (only begotten), the views and writings of several NIV translators were reviewed. The writings of Edwin Palmer reveal that he believes the term “begotten” refers to the Father begetting the Son in **eternity past**, as shown on p. 339. White’s mad rush through the book missed this quote, evidently. Here, Palmer even notes that it is strange that the Bible doesn’t **also** note that “the Holy Spirit was begotten by the Father.” Palmer definitely has unique views about the word begotten. The definitive treatise on monogenes, by Buchsel, disagrees with Palmer and agrees with me, saying John 1:14 and 1:18 do **not** discuss any “eternal begetting”.*

*“The issue at hand is not who is correct, but what do NIV translators believe about the Greek term monogenes and the English word ‘begotten’. (Paralleling Joseph Smith’s quote next to Palmer’s simply proves that **both** have views relating to the word ‘beget’ which **exclude** the Holy Ghost and thereby disconnect the **term** from the incarnation, as has historically been understood. See Adam Clarke’s Commentary, The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, et al.) The law of first mention **and** the context of John 1:14,18 would lead **anyone** to note that the first use of ‘beget’ (Gen. 4:18) and ‘begotten’ (Gen. 5:4 and John 1:14) indicate it refers to **flesh**.)*

*“White’s own ignorance of such theological discussions leads him to make quantum leaps of logic and READ INTO the book notions and words that ARE NOT THERE. White erects straw men, then cites quotes by Palmer on the incarnation to dismantle **his own** contrived misreading of my book. Interestingly, however, it should be noted that in Palmer’s quotes **about** the incarnation, he NEVER uses the term ‘begotten’ because he does **not** connect this word with the incarnation like most Christians do. That’s WHY the NIV omits ‘beget’ from the Bible! The **BOLD MISREPRESENTATION** is White’s; New Age Bible Versions does not assert that “Palmer denies the role of the Holy Ghost in the Incarnation.””*

To counter this refutation, White<sup>3 p 124</sup> has a note, which states, his emphasis *“The tape of the radio debate between me and Mrs Riplinger plainly shows that she **was** speaking of the Incarnation and asserting that Palmer denied the role of the Holy Spirit in it.”*

White should therefore have provided a transcript of the pertinent part of the debate in his book, in order to show his readers that he was telling the truth and not merely conveying his own opinion of the debate. Significantly, he fails to do so.

Ironically, White has this misleading comment<sup>3 p 104</sup> with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s revelations on Edwin Palmer, *“Sadly, people have burned NIVs as a result of this kind of distortion.”*

By comparison, Rome, the progenitor of the NIV<sup>8 p 299ff</sup> – see also **Appendix, Tables A1-A4**, with Cardinal Carlo Martini working in co-operation with the editors of the NIV’s Greek text, burned both bibles *and* bible believers.



Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>39 p 779-80</sup> that, her emphasis, “an English law, which was enforced for over 125 years, called for “extreme thoroughness in searching out and burning all books and Bibles associated with Wycliffe. This leaves us with just a token of the copies then in use. Many Christians were “burned at the stake in London in 1496 with their manuscripts [hand written Bibles] tied around their necks.” Foxe\* describes many others martyred for possessing “a little book of Scripture **in English.**””

\*Forbush, who edited Fox’s *Book of Martyrs*, states<sup>106 p 138</sup> that “When Lollardy [Wycliffe’s followers] increased, and the flames kindled, it was a common practice to fasten about the neck of the condemned heretic such of these scraps of Scripture as were found in his possession, which generally shared his fate.”

Note that England was still officially *Catholic* at this time. Churchill<sup>107 p 51</sup> reveals that England’s break with Rome did not occur until King Henry VIII passed an “Act...vesting the succession in [Princess] Elizabeth [later Queen Elizabeth I, 1558-1603]. In March 1534 every person of legal age, male or female, was forced to swear allegiance to this Act and renounce allegiance to all foreign authority in England.”

In spite of Henry’s subsequent cruelty towards dissenters and Mary Tudor’s efforts to re-subjugate England to the Roman yoke during her short and brutal reign of 1553-1558, Henry’s Act eventually led to the accession of Elizabeth and was thus a vital step in the process that achieved the translation of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

Rome, however, has not given up. As Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>39 p 780, 872-7</sup> further, her emphases.

“The “furnace” which burned at the stake thousands of Christians and thousands upon thousands of Bibles sent its sparks flying in the face of “any part” of the Bible its critics could not bear. Hundreds upon hundreds were martyred for their belief that “every word” in their **English Bible** was **true** (Psalm 12:6, Proverbs 30:5).”

She lists numerous examples, starting with “**Ralph Allerton**...burned at the stake in 1557. Because he had no ink in prison, he – **wrote in his own blood**:

““I believe the Scripture to be true, and in defence of the same I intend to give my life, rather than I will deny any part thereof, God willing.””

The testimony of Ralph Allerton and those of the multitude of martyrs like him, are a resounding rebuke to James White.

Concerning Rome’s current tactics, Dr Mrs Riplinger states.

“There is no compelling need in our English culture to burn [AV1611] Bibles, or bind to the stake those “living epistles” who have memorized scripture. The adversary simply burns a few more CDs, DVDs or NIVs [on CD] to inflame and entangle the souls of men...The “children of pride” are still burning Bibles – word by word (Job 41:34)...Rome recommended, “giving over our judgement” to the writings of the “schoolmen.” Again, today, we are being drawn into a new Dark Age with ‘language and lexicon studies,’ using definitions in Strong’s or Thayer’s lexicons which were generated from the writings of **the very men** (Cyprian, Augustine, Cyril, etc.) recommended by Rome in the old Dark Ages.”

Early in his book<sup>3 p 3</sup>, White ridicules bible belief with the following equation.

“The King James Bible Alone = The Word of God Alone.”

(This equation would be correct if amended as follows.

*“The King James Bible ~~Alone~~ = The Word of God ~~Alone~~.”*)

Dr Mrs Riplinger responds with an authentic equation, which is also extremely sinister, her emphases.

*“James Strong, author of the Strong’s Concordance, was a liberal who was on the corrupt American Standard Version committee (1909). The chairman of the ASV translation, arch-liberal Phillip Schaff, is quoted saying that he selected only committee members who **denied the inspiration** of the scriptures...Strong’s Greek and Hebrew **definitions** are simply **his own** collation of his corrupt ASV readings...The modern versions often use the ASV word. Therefore,*

*“Strong’s definitions = ASV = NIV, TNIV, NKJV, ESV, HCSB, and NASB.*

*“Such wolves were recognised in a note in the Matthew’s Bible of 1549. It said,*

*““The open enemy is most ugly in sight,*

*““But the wolf in the **lamb’s skin** doeth all the spite...””*

The equation that Dr Mrs Riplinger gives above clearly encapsulates much of the present-day Laodicean apostasy.

See James White’s endorsement of Phillip Schaff’s opinion on so-called “text-types” in **Chapter 3**. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s disclosure gives White further incentive to discredit her.

She continues<sup>39 p 880, 888</sup>, warning about Rome’s Dark Age “schoolmen” and their unnervingly all-too-familiar ‘modern’ methods.

*“A dark shadow is cast over the pews by a pulpit chained Bible and a large head, looming with lexical definitions. Such a shadow leaves listeners looking darkly at the English Bible in their laps. Dead men’s words, buried in numerous contradictory lexicons, cast questions on the **living** words of the Holy Bible.”*

Like the words of Phillip Schaff lauded by James White, or like those<sup>8 p 104</sup> of ‘our critic,’ “This version like every other [especially the AV1611!] must be subject to the original languages.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger warns, with respect to going to ‘the Greek.’

*“The persecution of Christians and Bibles was most severe under Catholic **Queen Mary**. When she reinstated the Catholic mass in 1553, priests presented various Greek “authorities,” such as “Theodoret,” “to prove that” **the Greek word** reinforced the Catholic point of view on communion.*

*“When **John Rogers**, editor of the Matthew’s Bible, was burned at the stake, he said that saying the Latin mass and quoting the Greek text were forbidden by the Bible. When imprisoned and called before the Catholic judges, he said,*

*““To speak with tongue,” said I, “is to speak with a strange tongue, as Latin or **Greek**, etc.,...and so to speak, is **not to speak unto men...[it is] to speak unto the wind.**””*

Or as the Apostle Paul said.

*“So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air” 1 Corinthians 14:9.*

White now seeks to vindicate Calvin Linton, who it seems assisted with the literary style of the NIV. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of “taking bits and pieces...all the time ignor-

ing context, all in the attempt to present a particular viewpoint on the part of Dr Calvin Linton.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 261-2</sup> cites Dr Linton’s evaluation of the scriptures as follows, her emphasis.

*“The Bible is “God’s message” and not his words, contends Linton. He believes the bible is “the wrong side of a beautiful embroidery. The picture is still there, but knotted, blurry – not beautiful, not perfect.” He calls Christians “amusingly uninformed,” who presume the Holy Spirit dictated the actual words of the text of the original authors.”*

She includes this citation with those of several other new version editors, including Westcott and Hort, who all expressed doubts about any written scriptures as the actual words of God. One, Ronald Youngblood, of the NIV committee, is even quoted as stating, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis, that *““the bible is the “words of men,” a literary production.””*

She then contrasts their opinions with the scriptures, e.g. Matthew 5:18, *“For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law.”*

And Proverbs 30:5, *“Every word of God is pure.”*

White inserts an extended quote of *“what Dr Linton actually said,”* his emphasis. Linton’s full article is available online<sup>108</sup>.

It appears from Linton’s article that *“a devout reader of the Bible”* wrote to him with some *“amusingly uninformed”* questions, such as *“why there needed to be any modern translations of the Bible at all.”* As part of his response to these questions, Linton states plainly that it is presumption to believe *“that the Holy Spirit dictated the actual words of the text to the original writers,”* because *“The style of the Bible...is not homogeneous. Rather, each writer has his own style, reflective of his personality.”* Like Hodge and Warfield - see comments in previous chapter on Revelation 22:19 - Linton believes only in *“the inerrancy of the original autographs”* and implies that *“the Bible,”* evidently any bible, is as far short of *“the original autographs...without error”* as the Lord’s physical body while He was on this earth was inferior to His glorified state before *“the Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us”* John 1:14, so that with any bible, we see *“no more than...the wrong side of a Persian rug.”*

Like the one Linton is lying like. See the scriptures that Dr Mrs Riplinger highlights above.

The precise expression describing any bible as *“the wrong side of a beautiful embroidery. The picture is still there, but knotted, blurry – not beautiful, not perfect.”* does not occur as such in the article and may simply be the result of a misplaced enclose quote mark but Dr Mrs Riplinger’s assessment is correct, as even White’s extended quote shows. Linton clearly believes that any extant scripture is no more than *“God’s message,”* i.e. not God’s actual words but God’s message wrapped up in man’s words.

This evaluation of Linton’s essay is not difficult to illustrate.

Further on in his article, Linton compares the work of bible translation with James Boswell’s efforts to produce a biography of Dr Samuel Johnson and the translation into English of the works of Homer. Such arbitrary association of *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21 with mere secular works amounts to what Dr Hills<sup>65 p 3, 110</sup> refers to as the *“natural-*

*istic method...with its own doctrine that the New Testament is nothing more than a human book.”* And as Dr Hills rightly observes.

*“This suggestion leads to conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent. It would have us believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the True Text was not restored until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope’s library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a waste basket on Mt. Sinai, and when Westcott and Hort were providentially guided to construct a theory of it which ignores God’s special providence and treats the text of the New Testament like the text of any other ancient book. But if the True New Testament Text was lost for 1500 years, how can we be sure that it has ever been found again?”*

A question that neither White nor Linton can satisfactorily answer. But Dr Hills’s analysis nevertheless vindicates Dr Mrs Riplinger’s and shows that White’s accusation that she has misrepresented Dr Linton is baseless. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis<sup>96 p 70-1</sup> in which, like Dr Hills, she effectively disposes of Linton’s naturalistic approach, her emphases.

*“The following scenario puts an impossible strain on the imagination. God left his church without the word from AD 330 (Vaticanus) to 1881; the church did not have the true word of God for fifteen hundred years. It was **restored** in 1881 by spiritualists and heretics, like Westcott and Hort...It was **refined** recently by five liberal scholars, one of which was Roman Catholic Cardinal Carlo Martini of the Pontifical Biblical Institute...This text-type, never used by the body of Christ in the nineteen hundred-year history of the church, is **accepted** by the “**blind**,” “**lukewarm**” Laodicean church...**not** commended for keeping the word, like the preceding Philadelphia church period.”*

Cloaked in language about literary style, this is the kind of scenario about which Linton is trying to persuade his readers, although his essay suggests that believers have not had access to God’s true word for considerably more than 1500 years. They have apparently been deprived of them since long before the 4<sup>th</sup> century, ever since the disappearance of “*the original autographs...without error*,” as Hodge and Warfield<sup>73 p 237-8</sup> described them. See previous chapter.

White<sup>3 p 106-7</sup> now turns to a letter written by “*Dr James Price, the former executive editor of the NKJV Old Testament*,” where Dr Price cites several Old Testament references in an effort to prove that “*the “conspiratorial” kind of thinking that fills the pages of [New Age Versions] could be turned back on the KJV Only advocate.*”

These references are Genesis 36:24, 1 Samuel 2:25, Isaiah 19:10, Hosea 13:9 and Malachi 2:12. The NKJV readings for these verses against the AV1611 are respectively, “*water*,” “*God*,” “*wages will be troubled in soul*,” “*you are destroyed*” and “*The man...being awake and aware.*”

Dr Price argues that the readings of the AV1611 could be construed as “*a New Age attack on the Word of God for which water is a symbol*” in Genesis 36:24, “*a New Age denial that God will judge sinners*” in 1 Samuel 2:25, “*a New Age attack on the spiritual nature of man, attempting to lower him to a mere animal*” in Isaiah 19:10, “*a New Age corrupting of the Word of God*” in Hosea 13:9 because “*the KJV reads...with no apparent support from any ancient authority*” and “*a New Age attack on spiritual alertness, replacing it with godless scholarship*” in Malachi 2:12.

**Table A1, Appendix** shows that the NKJV agrees with the DR, NIV, JB, NWT against the AV1611 in Genesis 36:24, 1 Samuel 2:25, with the NIV, JB (according to sense), NWT

in Isaiah 19:10 against the AV1611 and with the NWT in Hosea 13:9 (according to sense), Malachi 2:12 against the AV1611. The NKJV is therefore aligning itself with some of the most notorious ‘New Age’ translations in all of these references and Dr Price should therefore refrain from being facetious.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 6</sup> responds as follows, her emphases.

*“White includes a lengthy quote from NKJV Old Testament editor James Price to **prove** that the KJV is New Age too. For example, Price asserts that the KJV rendering “found mules” instead of “found water” is “a New Age attack...”*

*“Gen. 36:24: The new version’s translation of yemin as ‘hot springs’ or ‘found water’ is based on Jerome’s Latin Vulgate **interpretation** (see Gesenius, “Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon,” p. 351). One commentator notes, “Hebrew words have as many as three meanings with the same letters, and as many as ten meanings when traced back to the roots.” Calvin, Luther, and Clarke side with the KJV rendering. Price’s pretense that “mules” promote the New Age agenda is funny.*

*“I Sam. 2:25: This is a gem! Price’s pretense is unconscionable. He faults the KJV for translating elohim as ‘judges’ here, yet he translated elohim as ‘judges’ in **his** NKJV in Ex. 21:6, 22:8, 22:9a, and 22:9b! Using Price’s logic, we must ask of his NKJV, “Do you suppose this is a New Age denial that God will judge sinners?” His dissemblance to fool readers that elohim always means ‘God’ is deceitful at best. **All** versions variously translate this word dozens of ways. The NIV uses **40** different words to translate elohim such as, “goddesses, angels, idols, and heavenly beings.” Even Strong notes that it is “occasionally applied by way of deference to magistrates...judges.”*

*“The rest of Price’s verse samples are equally devoid of accuracy, content, meaning, or relevance to any ‘New Age’ implications. The **weak** and too often deceitful case of new version advocates gives **added** proof of the veracity of the **King James Version.**”*

The word in Isaiah 19:10 that the AV1611 gives as **“fish”** and the NKJV gives as **“soul”** is **“nephesh.”** As Dr Mrs Riplinger points out with respect to **“elohim,”** **“nephesh”** can have a variety of meanings, almost 30, according to Young<sup>71</sup>. One of them is **“beast,”** given three times as such by the AV1611 in Leviticus 24:18 and translated each time as **“animal”** in the NKJV, which is somewhat ironic in the light of Price’s comment above.

The AV1611 reading in Hosea 13:9, **“thou hast destroyed thyself,”** has been considered elsewhere<sup>8 p 54</sup>. It is correct because **“Israel wilfully rejected the words of God, Hosea 6:5-7, 8:1, 12 and destroyed HERSELF. Hosea 13:9, 14:4-8 show that God will NOT destroy Israel”** this author’s emphases.

Price’s comment on Malachi 2:12 is misleading because the Lord is about to **“cut off”** the individuals concerned in the AV1611 and is petitioned to do so in the NKJV, i.e. **“May the Lord cut off etc.”** **“Spiritual alertness”** is not the context but the marginal reading of the AV1611, both the 1611 and contemporary Cambridge Cameo editions, **“the importance”** of which White insists **“should not be overlooked,”** shows that the King James translators did consider the reading found in the NKJV but clearly inserted an accurate and more appropriate idiomatic rendering.

White insists that these 5 examples demonstrate that bible believers **“are using double standards”** when holding up the modern versions as evidence of New Age conspiracies. But as the above analyses show, it is White and Price who are evincing double standards.

White now complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger shows **“a complete unwillingness to admit error”** in spite of **“the refutation of many of her points in her initial work.”** He accuses

her of “*a complete misdirection of the line of thinking*” with respect to “*the correction of her misrepresentation of Dr Edwin Palmer*” because of what White claims Dr Mrs Riplinger said on a radio broadcast that he does not substantiate with a transcript. See comments above. Again, White’s accusations are baseless.

White makes some further paltry attempts to discredit Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work by means of references to a couple of misspelled proper names and a slightly inexact quote, inspection of which shows that the sense is unaltered. White gives the quote, from a Mormon source, as follows. “*The heads of the Gods appointed one God for us.*” Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>96 p 62</sup> gives it as “*The heads of the gods appointed a God for us.*” But Dr Mrs Riplinger’s point, which White quotes but fails to comment on, is that “*Palmer’s “begotten God” (John 1:18...)”* which he declares<sup>108 p 163</sup> is how “*the KJV...should read*” is as unsound theologically as “*the Mormon notion*” given above, whichever version of the quote is used. Both are heretical.

Inspection of White’s citations of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books shows that he actually discredits himself, by omitting her disclosure that White repeatedly misspelt her name in his original critique of New Age Versions<sup>96 p 63</sup>.

White’s final attack of any substance against Gail Riplinger is with respect to her supposed failure to acknowledge that only “*“a tiny percentage of corrupt Greek manuscripts”...actually lack the phrase “His name and” at Revelation 14:1.*” White complains “*she simply listed some Greek manuscripts that contained the phrase and passed over her own error in silence.*”

See discussion in support of Revelation 14:1, as it stands in the AV1611 in the previous chapter. Inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement in *New Age Versions*<sup>14 p 99-100</sup>, which White himself quotes<sup>3 p 124</sup>, shows that it is James White who has “*passed over*” his “*own error in silence.*”

The essence of the statement is as follows.

*“All new versions, based on a tiny percentage of corrupt Greek manuscripts, make the fatefully frightening addition of three words in Revelation 14:1... “his name and”.”*

As Gail Riplinger shows in detail later in her work<sup>14 p 545ff</sup>, in Chapter 39, entitled *The 1% Manuscripts* and as has been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 Chapter 1</sup>, the new versions are definitely “*based on a tiny percentage of corrupt Greek manuscripts.*”

And being therefore corrupt themselves, they retain other corruptions that regrettably appear to have found their way into the greater portion of Greek witnesses, as Dr Moorman has shown in detail<sup>11</sup> but have nevertheless been providentially excluded from “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21, the AV1611.

White now takes Dr Ruckman to task<sup>3 p 109</sup>, for “*Spearheading the KJV Only Movement.*”

His first specific criticisms of Dr Ruckman come in the form of notes<sup>3 p 124-5</sup>, with respect to Dr Ruckman’s book, *Custer’s Last Stand*<sup>57</sup>, in which he answers the book<sup>109</sup> by Dr Stewart Custer of Bob Jones University which has a similar theme to White’s and is entitled *The Truth about the King James Version Controversy*.

Custer states dogmatically in his *Introduction* that, “*Fundamentalists...must remember that the court of last resort in doctrinal matters is not any translation but the wording of the original Greek and Hebrew texts.*”

As also quoted more fully by White<sup>3 p 110</sup>, Dr Ruckman responds<sup>57 p 4</sup>, his emphases, “*No man on this earth, saved or lost, could go to ANY “original Greek and Hebrew texts” as*

*“a court of last resort” because they are not here. Such a “court” doesn’t even EXIST.”*

White’s response to Dr Ruckman is merely obfuscation. His note is as follows, his emphases.

*“This is the true mark of Ruckmanism: the denial, through the use of equivocation, of the existence of the original **readings** of the New Testament text...The whole point of the tenacity of the New Testament text, however, is that the **original readings** still exist, faithfully preserved in the New Testament manuscript tradition. By denying the existence of the “originals,” Ruckman reduces his reader to a need for a supernatural way to know what the “originals” read. This ignores, of course, the fact that God has preserved the **readings** of the autographs in the manuscript tradition down through the ages...Ruckmanism...[denies] that the original **readings** have been faithfully preserved, requiring instead the supernatural inspiration of the AV1611 so as to have **certainty** on these readings.”*

Naturally, White avoids stating which “manuscript tradition” he is referring to. But this so-called “tradition” has been disclosed earlier in this work. See discussion in **Chapter 3** about Kurt Aland’s professed “tenacity of the New Testament text.”

And note again Dr Ruckman’s remarks<sup>1 p 216-7</sup> about “original readings” in that context.

*“Jimmy pretended that he had the original “readings” in his hands. He did this while telling you the King James “readings,” quoted before A.D. 330 were not valid. What he is telling you now is that he and his book-selling buddies have a perfect revelation<sup>3 p 47</sup> of God (see above) and you don’t...*

*“The “perfect revelation” ...is two corrupt Greek texts which the Body of Christ (not an elite group of Nicolaitans) dumped 1,650 years ago.”*

That is White’s “faithfully preserved...New Testament manuscript tradition.” To reiterate Dean Burgon’s statement<sup>13 p 343</sup> – see **Chapters 3, 4**, which applies as much to White as it does to Hort and Tischendorf.

*“Dr. Hort contends that [the Truth of Scripture] more than half lay perdu on a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; - Dr. Tischendorf, that it had been deposited in a waste-paper basket in the convent of S. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai, - from which he rescued it on the 4<sup>th</sup> February 1859: - neither, we venture to think, a very likely circumstance. We incline to believe that the Author of Scripture hath not by any means shown Himself so unmindful of the safety of the Deposit, as those distinguished gentlemen imagine.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 86</sup> also states, his emphases.

*“If you “believe what Ruckman believes” about the **Holy Bible** of the English Reformation...you are denying the existence of the original READINGS of the New Testament<sup>3 p 124</sup> ...He had just said the original “readings” were what we were **after**<sup>3 p 48</sup> [preserved via Aland’s “tenacity of the New Testament text,” White’s emphasis] but then he says they didn’t count if they were Byzantine,<sup>3 p 43-5, 188</sup> [because the Byzantine is “conflated” and contains “expansion(s) of piety”] and now he says they **EXIST**, **but** he would reject them<sup>3 p 120, 151-3, 188</sup> if they were not “text-types” [because “the [New Testament] text that existed [in AD 200] looked most like the Alexandrian text-type...not the Byzantine text-type”]...*

*“The idea is absolutely transparent: **you** are to trust him because **he** (or his fellow apostates) know **Greek** and **you** don’t. So he has the original “readings” and **you** don’t,*

*unless you have the ones he has...[but] the original manuscripts with the original words do not exist. If an Alexandrian says they do, he is lying. All White can mumble is that he has the “original readings” of the “original autographs.” But, of course, by this he means – they never talk plain – the mutilated, defiled, corrupt African-Egyptian readings of Nestle-Hort-Aland-Metzger’s phoney Greek New Testament.”*

The corruptions to which Dr Ruckman refers have been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 13, 44-5, 56-90, 105-43, 149-215, 258-61, 290-8, 301-14, 323-42</sup>. See also the works by Moorman<sup>9, 11</sup> and the citations in this work from Burgon<sup>13 p 11, 16, 314-17, 319-20, 325, 337, 343, 344, 376, 397</sup>, in **Chapter 3**, on Aleph and B, the “*great treasure*” and “*great codex*,” according to James White<sup>3 p 33</sup>.

White is of course blatantly lying when he insists that bible believers, i.e. adherents of “*Ruckmanism*,” deny “*that the original readings have been faithfully preserved.*”

Note again how Dr Vance<sup>27</sup> has summarised bible belief in God’s faithful preservation of the “*the original readings*” as follows, from “*the Original Sacred Tongues*” according to the *Epistle Dedicatory* of the Holy Bible, to the biblical English of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible. See ***The Revision Conspiracy***.

- A received Hebrew text, 1800 BC to 389 BC
- A received Aramaic text at the same time (Genesis, Daniel, etc.)
- A received Greek text from AD 40 to AD 90
- A received Syrian text from AD 120 to AD 200
- A received Latin text from AD 150 to AD 1500
- A received German text from AD 1500 to AD 2006
- A received English text from AD 1611 to AD 2006

And note again, God’s providential preservation of the Holy Bible in English<sup>27</sup>, derived from *The Rules to be Observed in the Translation of the Bible*, Rules 1 and 14:

- Tyndale’s Bible (15250)
- Coverdale’s Bible (1535)
- Matthew’s Bible (1537)
- The Great Bible (1539)
- The Bishops’ Bible (1568)
- The Geneva Bible (1582)
- The King James 1611 Authorised Version

If Wycliffe’s Bible<sup>8 p 21</sup> of 1382 was put first in the list of English bibles, God’s providential preservation of the Holy Bible in English would still exhibit 7 stages of refinement because Tyndale’s Bible would be merged with Coverdale’s and Matthew’s, each of which used Tyndale’s New Testament. See also this author’s earlier work for a similar diagrammatic summary<sup>8 p 12</sup>.

White also criticises<sup>3 p 125</sup>, his emphases, Dr Ruckman for “*ridiculing the idea that we can determine what words Paul wrote originally [because...in the vast majority of the writings of Paul (or any other writer of scripture) we can determine exactly what was originally written because there are no textual variants to hinder us from doing so!...How Ruckman could deny this is beyond imagination.*”



White inserts Colossians 2:9 in this note as an example of an “*original reading*,” without “*textual variants*,” given as “*Deity*,” in the NASV, NIV, which reading White professes to prefer<sup>3 203-4</sup> to “**Godhead**” as found in the AV1611. This verse will be considered in more detail, when White’s Chapter 8 is addressed, wherein he declares the superiority of the modern reading over that of the AV1611.

For now, Dr Ruckman’s answer to White’s method of ascertaining “*what was originally written*” is as follows<sup>1 p 221-3</sup>.

He cites Dr Hills<sup>110 p 36-8</sup> as follows.

*“If we believe that the New Testament Scriptures are the infallibly inspired Word of God, then it is logical for us to believe that God has preserved this written Word by His special providence in the usage of His Church through the universal priesthood of believers. It is logical also to believe that soon after the invention of printing this written Word was placed in print and became the Textus Receptus, being immediately received by believers everywhere and made the basis of faithful translations such as the King James Version. But conservative scholars, by and large, have been so brain-washed by naturalistic propaganda that they hesitate to follow this logic of faith...”*

Dr Hills’s logic follows that of Dr Vance’s outline of the providential preservation of scripture – see above. Dr Hills continues.

*“There are conservative scholars who seem to feel that God’s providential care over the New Testament is adequately defined by the saying that the true reading has been preserved in at least one of the extant New Testament manuscripts...But has the special providence of God over the New Testament text done no more than to preserve the true readings somewhere...in some one or other of the great number of New Testament manuscripts now existing in the world?...How [then] can His people ever be certain that they have the true New Testament text? For not all the extant manuscripts have yet been discovered. It may be that many of them still remain in the obscurity into which they were plunged centuries ago...How can we be sure that many true readings in these undiscovered manuscripts?”*

Dr Ruckman answers<sup>1 p 223</sup>, his emphases, “You can’t...[the Alexandrians] think they have the “*original*” text if there is no “*variant*” to the text that they have **now**. They did this after recommending two versions (NASV and NIV) that altered more than 4,000 “*variants*” **which had now variants before AD 1500** [coincident with the discovery of Codex B, Vaticanus in 1481<sup>8 p 13</sup>].”

And then, as Dr Ruckman emphasises<sup>1 p 222</sup>, “The “*variants*” used to alter the AV all showed up together in the RV of 1881-1884 (Westcott and Hort).”

Until then, the body of Christ had not recognised these “*variants*,” which existed only in the critical editions of unregenerate bible rejecters such as Griesbach et alia, because as Hodges states, the prevailing view amongst the Lord’s people was that “*All minority text forms are, on this view, merely divergent offshoots of the broad stream of transmission whose source is the autographs themselves...*”

See discussion on Erasmus and the Received Text in **Chapter 4**.

Hodges’s summary appears to have been the prevailing view even at Princeton Theological Seminary until the professorship of A. A. Hodge, according to another Presbyterian publication, entitled *Biblical Authority and Interpretation*, published in 1982<sup>111 p 26</sup>.

This publication states that, this author's underlining, "*The son and successor of Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, shifted away from his father's insistence on the inerrancy of the traditional text in use to the inerrancy of the (lost) original autographs. A. A. Hodge with B. B. Warfield co-authored the definitive statement in the Princeton doctrine of Scripture, summarized in an 1881 article on "Inspiration."*"

*"Nevertheless the historical faith of the Church has always been that all the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, are without any error, when the ipsissima verba [very same words] of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural sense."*

See the discussion in **Chapter 4** on Revelation 22:19.

This is the attitude that James White has towards the scriptures and he assumes that he is on safe ground with passages where "*no textual variants*" exist (that he knows of) because it means that you have "*exactly what was originally written.*"

But as Hills describes and as Dr Ruckman has emphasised, this view is fatally flawed, because it requires, at the very least, that *all* the extant manuscripts have been discovered and exhaustively collated.

In truth, all extant manuscripts have *not* been discovered and those that have been have *not* been exhaustively collated. See comments on von Soden's 'Majority' Text in the discussion on Codices Aleph and B in **Chapter 3**.

White's view is therefore subject to the same instability that Hills describes above and which is exemplified by the appearance of the RV and all modern versions since then. As Dr Ruckman describes above, when "*no textual variants*" were apparently superseded by *new "textual variants,"* many scholars flocked to them like the Athenians who "***spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing***" Acts 17:21b.

Dr Hills's quote inserted above has been expanded to contrast the bible believer's perception of the providential preservation of the scripture, as expressed by Dr Hills, with the "*naturalistic*" view that James White has adopted inadvertently or otherwise, leading to the kind of 'Athenian' conclusion that Dr Hills describes as "*extremely bizarre and inconsistent.*"

Because as Dr Hills explains – see comments above on Calvin Linton's essay - "*It would have us believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the True Text was not restored until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope's library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a waste basket on Mt. Sinai.*"

This is precisely James White's conclusion<sup>3 p 151-3</sup>, his emphases. Perhaps like no other examined so far, this passage, though subtly expressed, "***Yea, hath God said?***" Genesis 3:1b, reveals the hatred and blind prejudice that James White, like 'our critic'<sup>8 p 313</sup> before him, harbours for the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible and its underlying sources, his emphases.

*"If we were to transport ourselves to the year AD 200 and look at the text of the New Testament at that time...the text that existed looked most like the Alexandrian text-type...not the Byzantine text-type. How do we know this? Every one of the papyrus manuscripts we have discovered has been a representative of the Alexandrian, not the Byzantine text-type. The early Fathers who wrote at this time did not use the Byzantine text-type...An examination of the early translations of the New Testament reveals they were done on the basis*

of the Alexandrian type manuscripts, not Byzantine type manuscripts. And the early church fathers who wrote during the early centuries give no evidence in their citations of a familiarity with the Byzantine text-type.

“Finally, when we apply sound methods of examining the readings of the texts themselves... “internal criteria” point us to the Alexandrian, Western, or Caesarean, not the Byzantine, reading...”

“While it is not true in **every** instance that the older a manuscript is the better it is, it is **generally** true. Surely it is easy to understand that a manuscript that comes from only a century after the writing of the original, such as P66 or P75, should be given more “weight” in examining a variant reading than a manuscript from the fourteenth century...All of this demonstrates why we cannot simply “count” manuscripts, but must “weigh” them, looking at their general character, age, and text-type. Some manuscripts are simply more “important” in helping us to find the original text than others. In the light of these things we can understand why there are many times when the modern Greek texts will adopt a reading that is found in a minority of the Greek texts...either those minority texts carry great weight, or they are coupled with internal considerations that add to the weight of the manuscripts themselves...”

Inadvertently or otherwise, White has overlooked Burgon’s observation<sup>8 p 116, 77 p 266</sup> – see above - “In the very form of the maxim, - ‘**Not to be counted but to be weighed,**’ – the undeniable fact is overlooked that ‘number’ is the most ordinary ingredient of weight and indeed, even in matters of human testimony, is an element which cannot be cast away.”

White has also overlooked Burgon’s analysis in which he *did* address the “general character, age, and text-type” of manuscripts, according to his Seven Tests of Truth<sup>8 p 43, 9 p 131, 10</sup>, as scientific a method of examining New Testament sources as has ever been devised and far more genuinely scientific than anything put forward by James White. Burgon’s conclusions following the rigorous application of his scientific method – see citations above - about the “Some manuscripts... simply more “important,”” which undoubtedly include White’s “great treasure,” i.e. Aleph and “great codex,” i.e. B, should not be overlooked.

Moreover, having insisted that, generally, “the older a manuscript is the better it is,” White has ignored Pickering’s apt analogy, cited by Dr Grady<sup>8 p 116</sup>.

““What if a sewer pipe empties into the [pure] stream a few yards below the spring? Then the process is reversed - as the polluted water is exposed to the purifying action of the sun and ground, **THE FARTHER IT RUNS THE PURER IT BECOMES** (unless it passes more pipes). That is what happened to the stream of the New Testament transmission. Very near to the source, by 100 A.D. at least, **THE POLLUTION STARTED GUSHING INTO THE PURE STREAM**.”

See discussion on textual corruption in **Chapter 3**.

For further responses to White’s dogmatic assertions, see remarks under **Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness**, also **Chapter 2** for Moorman’s detailed summary<sup>9 p 16-17, 44</sup> showing that the papyri support the Byzantine, or Received Text against the Alexandrian in 39 passages versus 182 for the 356 doctrinal passages that he reviews, or 17%, an appreciable “Byzantine” proportion, and that the Old Latin and Syriac versions support the Received Text against the Alexandrian, or AV1611 versus the NIV, in ratio 2:1 and 3:1 respectively. Moorman<sup>9 p 49ff</sup> also shows that the church fathers before 400 AD support the Received or Traditional Text in ratio 3:2 against the Alexandrian and by an even greater ratio, 2:1, if fathers before 225 AD are considered.

See also this author's summary elsewhere<sup>8 Chapter 9</sup>, revealing with respect to the papyri, that, overall, Pickering's conclusion, that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites<sup>8 p 133</sup>, "*The TR [Textus Receptus] has more early attestation than B and twice as much as Aleph – evidently the TR reflects an earlier text than either B or Aleph.*"

In sum, White's flawed approach to the preservation of the scriptures amounts to the following.

1. Insist, like Hodge and Warfield that only "*the original autographs...are without any error,*" i.e. 'inspired' of God.
2. Pretend that no "*textual variants*" means that you have "*the original readings.*" (You don't because you have neither the original autographs nor all the extant and undiscovered manuscripts, which White's approach requires you to have.)
3. Where "*textual variants*" exist, use "*two corrupt Greek texts which the Body of Christ (not an elite group of Nicolaitans) dumped 1,650 years ago*" [Dr Ruckman] to 'correct' the AV1611, because "*the [New Testament] text that existed [in AD 200] looked most like the Alexandrian text-type...not the Byzantine text-type,*" which, by inspection, amounts to more circular reasoning on the part of James White
4. Where Aleph and B happen to agree with the AV1611 Text, use anything else, e.g. Codex D, P46, even the 'Majority' Text, to alter the AV1611<sup>8 p 37, 291-3</sup>.

This is what White calls "*sound methods of examining the readings of the texts themselves.*" Readers may draw their own conclusions.

White's notion that Dr Ruckman "*is ridiculing the idea that we can determine what words Paul wrote originally*" stems from a partial quote from one of Dr Ruckman's works<sup>112 p 14</sup>, described by White<sup>3 p 124</sup> as "*his attack on the NKJV.*"

Note that White inserts this partial quote after devoting several pages<sup>3 p 97ff</sup> to (falsely) accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of "*a plethora of out-of-context citations and edited quotations.*"

The partial quote from Dr Ruckman's work reads as follows.

*"It is this maniacal obsession that makes men like Massey, at Rodney Bell's school, insist that he can find out the EXACT WORD that God gave Paul when Paul wrote his manuscripts; and it is this same egotism that makes patsies like Stewart Custer (Bob Jones University) tell us that he reads the "verbally inspired original" New Testament daily because he holds it in his hand."*

The context of the quote<sup>112 p 13</sup> consists of 12 citations from Proverbs, which Dr Ruckman gives as examples to show that the NKJV "*contains scores of Westcott and Hort Alexandrian readings as they are found in the ASV and NASV...*"

The readings from Proverbs are as follows, with the AV1611 reading given first, followed by the NKJV and NASV readings.

Proverbs 1:4 "*subtilty,*" "*prudence,*" "*prudence,*" 1:5 "*counsels,*" "*counsel,*" "*counsel,*" 1:6 "*dark sayings,*" "*riddles,*" "*riddles,*" 1:32 "*prosperity,*" "*complacency,*" "*complacency,*" 2:1 "*hide,*" "*treasure,*" "*treasure,*" 2:7 "*layeth up,*" "*stores up,*" "*stores up,*" 7:6 "*casement,*" "*lattice,*" "*lattice,*" 7:11 "*stubborn,*" "*rebellious,*" "*rebellious,*" 7:12 "*streets,*" "*open square,*" "*square,*" 7:16 "*fine,*" "*coloured,*" "*coloured,*"

(the NKJV, NASV omit “*with carved works*” from this verse) 8:17 “*early,*” “*diligently,*” “*diligently,*” 12:4 “*virtuous,*” “*excellent,*” “*excellent.*”

Dr Ruckman then prefixes with these comments, his emphases, the statement that White quotes.

*“The New “King James” Bible then is **not** a King James Bible at all nor is it related to any revision of any edition of any AV put out in the last 330 years by anyone. It is a resurrected ASV-RSV for dead orthodox Conservatives and apostate Fundamentalists in colleges and universities who still hold to their ORIGINAL POSITION: **they can correct the Bible anytime they feel like it** because they are superior intellects who are in charge of absolute authority.”*

Dr Ruckman’s citation by James White consists of his valid conclusions of how modern version editors exercise “*subjective considerations*” – see Pickering’s comments above – in compiling their texts. White has contrived his note to obscure the context of Dr Ruckman’s analysis. His contrivance is clearly an “*out-of-context citation.*”

White then quotes<sup>3 p 110</sup> further from Dr Ruckman’s response<sup>57 p 4</sup>, his emphases, to Stewart Custer as follows, in part, where Dr Ruckman sets forth Stewart Custer’s actual perception (and that of James White) of “*the “last resort” in doctrinal matters (Custer, Introduction)...*”

*“We “Greek and Hebrew” scholars ARE THE FINAL AND LAST COURT OF RESORT IN DOCTRINE.”*

And White interposes a note<sup>3 p 125</sup> that states, “*the AV 1611 was translated on the very same principles of textual critical study that Ruckman decries in modern translations, the argument is obviously circular.*”

But the AV1611 was not “*translated on the very same principles of textual critical study that Ruckman decries in modern translations.*” And therefore Dr Ruckman’s argument is not “*obviously circular.*”

See remarks under *God’s Book – the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible*, by Benjamin Wilkinson and Dr Donald Waite, describing the superior methods of King James translators, compared to those of the modern translators.

Dr Waite<sup>23 p 88-92</sup> notes further that, his emphasis, “*Each [of the King James translators] had to translate all the books that were on his schedule to translate...**unaided by anyone else.** The men who translated the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION, the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION, and the NEW KING JAMES VERSION, didn’t have that qualification. In these versions you had a great deal of window-dressing. You had people on the committee with degrees, “scholars” who may know many things. Many of them were on the committee in order to induce people to buy their version, so the publisher could make a lot of money on it...But **each and every man** on each of the committees for the above versions (and other versions as well) did **not** have to translate from the Hebrew or Greek to English by themselves...”*

Of the work on the AV1611, Dr Waite declares that “*No less than **fourteen different times** the translation for each book was gone over...This is unusual, and so far as we know, a never before and never afterward team technique that was used. It is certainly superior!”*

Dr Waite explains with respect to the translation methods that the King James translators used, versus those of the modern translators, his emphases, “*The KING JAMES Transla-*

*tors Adopted the Verbal Equivalence and the Formal Translation Technique. The superior translation technique of the KING JAMES translation employed what we call both the verbal equivalence and formal equivalence. They avoided what we call dynamic equivalence...*

*“Now, the problem with all these other versions (including the NIV, NASV, NKJV, and the rest) is that they have purposefully selected a non-verbal equivalence type of translation, a non-formal equivalence type of translation, and a non-literal equivalence type of translation. Instead, to a greater or lesser extent, they have purposefully adopted a dynamic equivalence type of translation. “Dynamic” implies “change” or “movement”...they didn’t do a word-for-word method (even when it made good sense), trying to make the words in the Hebrew or Greek equal to the words in the English. Instead, they added to what was there, changed what was there and/or subtracted from what was there. If it was a question they might have made a statement, left out words and so on. They didn’t care. Paraphrase is another word for it...*

*“The KING JAMES Translators Rejected the DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE Translation Technique...The KING JAMES translators adopted a method of verbal equivalence; and formal equivalence, that is the words from the Greek or Hebrew were rendered as closely as possible into the English. The same is true for the forms of those words. This is called formal equivalence. We have verbs in English. We have nouns, adjectives, prepositions, participles, and so on. If the structure in the Hebrew language was such that it could be brought into the English in the same way, with the same forms, that is what they did. If you have a verb, they brought it over as a verb instead of changing it or transforming it into a noun...So the KING JAMES translators’ method was superior because it adopted verbal and formal equivalence translation and avoided DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE.*

*“DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE Is Diabolical...because we believe that Satan is at the root of it...*

*“The [new] versions we’re talking about here, NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION, even the NEW KING JAMES VERSION, all show this paraphrasing to one degree or another...We have a computer printout of the analysis of the NEW KING JAMES VERSION comparing it to the Hebrew and Greek; and we give over 2,000 examples, chapter and verse, of where the editors have added to, subtracted from, or changed the Words of God by paraphrase. [B.F.T., Bible for Today #1442] We’ve done the same for the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION, comparing it to the underlying Hebrew and Greek. We give chapter and verse for over 4,000 examples of where the editors have added to, subtracted from, or changed the Words of God by paraphrase. [B.F.T. #1494-P] We’ve done the same for the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION, comparing it to the underlying Hebrew and Greek. We give chapter and verse for over 6,653 examples of where the editors have added to, subtracted from, or changed the Words of God by paraphrase. [B.F.T. #1749-P] This methodology was sanctioned by the Devil himself in the Garden of Eden [“Yea, hath God said?” Genesis 3:1b]. That is why we call it diabolical. God does not want you and I to tamper with His words, did you know that?...When God says something, He expects us to follow it exactly, precisely, and not to go to the right hand or left hand.”*

Dr Waite goes on to expound this issue in considerable detail but even this brief citation is more than sufficient to show that, like the rest of White’s thesis, his throw-away remark that “the AV 1611 was translated on the very same principles of textual critical study that Ruckman decries in modern translations” does not withstand close scrutiny.

White<sup>3 p 110</sup> now seeks to defend Stewart Custer's assertion<sup>57 p 9, 109 p 6</sup> that "each of [the] four types of text Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean, Western] is theologically conservative." White regards Custer's assertion as a "transparently true statement."

Custer qualifies it as follows. "Each [text-type] sets forth an accurate gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, His deity, the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, the blood atonement, justification by faith, and the other major doctrines of the faith. Not one of these texts can be called heretical or apostate as Mr Ruckman alleges... Every one of the major doctrines of the faith is found in each kind of text. There is no attempt to twist or disparage any of the great doctrines of the faith."

Note in passing that Custer repeats the lie in this context that "The Byzantine text originated in the middle of the fourth century." See Hodges's conclusion and Moorman's analysis above and this author's summary elsewhere<sup>8 p 124ff</sup>.

Dr. Ruckman has this reply<sup>8 p 107-8, 57 p 9</sup>, of which White quoted only the last sentence. White was careful to omit the scholarly *authorities* in opposition to Custer.

"Not according to Zane Hodges, Donald Waite, Otis Fuller, Burgon, Miller, Scrivener, Edward Hills, Wilkinson, Pickering or Hoskier. Custer just gave you his own personal, unscholarly opinion and expected you to think he was talking about FACTS. He dreams up his "facts". He expected you to accept that statement above without questioning it. We say he is a DECEIVED FOOL and we will document WHY we say that."

Concerning Dr. Custer's statement that "Not one of these texts can be called heretical or apostate as Mr. Ruckman alleges", Dr. Ruckman replies:

"Flim-flam. ACCORDING TO TWO DOZEN BIBLE-BELIEVING CONSERVATIVES, Custer is an uneducated fool. Any knowledgeable person who has investigated the hundreds of pages of documented evidence on the Alexandrian manuscripts (patterns, family, pattern of texts, "niceties", idiomatic expressions, wording, etc.) knows of the HERETICAL and HETERODOX nature of those manuscripts (we will document)."

Dr Ruckman cites<sup>57 p 26-8</sup> numerous examples of heretical readings in the Alexandrian text, including many from Dr Hills's researches<sup>8 p 109-110, 57 p 136-8, 110 p 76-7</sup>.

"(a) Heretical Readings in Codex Aleph

"Some of the scribes who copied some of the ancient manuscripts were heretics, probably Gnostics, who altered the texts that they were copying rather freely in order to tone down the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures concerning Christ's deity. One of the manuscripts in which this heretical tendency shows itself most strongly is Codex Aleph...The following Aleph readings seem beyond all doubt heretical.

Mark 1:1 "the Son of God", is omitted by Aleph, Theta, 28, 255...Westcott and Hort.

Luke 23:42 according to...P75, Aleph, B, C, L and the Sahidic, the thief said, "Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom"...this prayer has been tampered with by the docetists who believed that the divine "Christ" returned to heaven just before the crucifixion.

- John 1:18* Hills reveals that the reading “*only begotten God*” is found in “*Papyrus 66, Aleph, B, C, L, the Peshitta Syriac, and Westcott and Hort*” and the reading “*the only begotten God*” is found in “*Papyrus 75, corrector c of Aleph, 33 and Bohairic version [a corrupt Egyptian version]*. Hills states that “*Burgon (1896) long ago traced these corruptions to...Valentinus, a famous Gnostic teacher*<sup>110 p 77</sup> [who] fabricated the reading(s)...to distinguish between the Son and the Word [as]...two distinct beings.”
- John 1:34* Instead of “*Son of God*”, *Aleph, P4, 77, 218, two Old Latin manuscripts, the Old Syriac version...read “God’s Chosen One”*
- John 3:13* “*who is in heaven*” is omitted by *Aleph, P66, P75, B, L, the Diatessaron, Westcott and Hort*”.
- John 6:69* Instead of “*the Christ, the Son of the living God*”, *Aleph, P75, B, C, D, L, W, Westcott and Hort...read “the Holy One of God”*.
- John 9:35* Instead of “*Son of God*”, *Aleph, P66, P75, B, W,...Westcott and Hort read, “Son of Man”*.
- John 9:38-39* “*And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him. And Jesus said*” are omitted by *Aleph, P75, W, Old Latin manuscripts b, l*.
- Roman 14:10* *Aleph, B, D2...(substitute) “judgment seat of God” for “judgment seat of Christ”*. It is difficult to believe that this substitution was not also made by heretics.
- 1 Timothy 3:16* The Alexandrian text (represented by *Aleph*) reads “*who was manifest in the flesh,*” and the Western text (represented by *D2* and the Latin versions) reads “*which was manifest in the flesh.*” Undoubtedly the Traditional reading, “*God was manifest in the flesh,*” was the original reading. This was altered by the Gnostics into the Western reading...in order to emphasise their favorite idea of mystery. Then this Western reading was later changed into the meaningless Alexandrian reading, “*who was manifest in the flesh.*””

Dr Hills concludes<sup>8 p 110, 110 p 77</sup> “*Here we have (ten) readings which either deny the deity of Christ or in some way detract from it. All (ten) of them are found in Aleph. All (ten) of them are supported by other ancient New Testament documents. (Six) of them occur in Papyrus 75...The longer we ponder the evidence of these important passages, the more obvious it becomes that the texts of Papyrus 75 and of Aleph were the work of heretics who for some reason were reluctant to acknowledge Jesus to be the Son of God. And the same seems to be true of B and the other manuscripts of the Alexandrian type. Long ago Burgon and Miller pointed out this heretical trait in Aleph and B, and their observations have never been refuted.*”

See comments in **Chapter 3** in response to White’s insistence that “*Philip Schaff [American Standard Version editor*<sup>14 p 457</sup>, the ASV being the American equivalent of the RV] estimated that...not one [textual variant] affected “*an article of faith or a precept of duty which is not abundantly sustained by other and undoubted passages, or by the whole tenor of Scripture teaching.*””

And note again Dr Hills’s conclusion, his emphasis<sup>1 p 111, 113</sup>, “*It is NOT true that there are no various readings which involve cardinal Christian doctrines. On the contrary, in*



*the handful of dissenting manuscripts there are a HOST of corrupt readings which ALL bring into question such doctrines as the essential GODHEAD of CHRIST.”*”

Note further Dr Moorman’s comments, in response to the article by Dr Daniel Wallace, discussed in the previous chapter.

“Wallace tells us “most textual critics for the past 250 years would say that no doctrine is affected by these changes”. Yes, that is what they and he [and White] say, and it is false. Many of God’s faithful servants have over the years compiled long lists of these alterations and omissions. They have set out clearly the extent to which the great doctrines have been weakened and undermined. It can only be due to peer pressure, scholarly pride and wilful blindness that this statement is made. My own list<sup>9</sup> of 356 passages gives a clear demonstration. He cannot merely brush this aside by saying: “Those who vilify the modern translations and the Greek texts behind them have evidently never really investigated the data. Their appeals are based largely on emotion, not evidence.” **Yes, we are filled with emotion when we see our Bible treated in this way, and we have also investigated the data.**” This author’s emphasis.

In other words, neither Custer’s assertion nor White’s endorsement of it are “*transparently true*” statements. They are outright *lies*.

White next takes issue<sup>3 p 111</sup> with Dr Ruckman’s response<sup>57 p 40</sup> to Custer’s statement<sup>109 p 21</sup> that “Mr Ruckman...claims again and again that “the English readings are superior to the Greek readings” (*Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, p. 116).”

(Note that Custer adds<sup>109 p 22</sup> that “Fundamentalists have always made clear that the inspiration and inerrancy which they were contending for was that of the original Greek and Hebrew manuscripts.” Custer inserts a citation to this effect, unaccompanied by any scripture. His statement is false. See comments earlier from *Biblical Authority and Interpretation*<sup>111 p 26</sup>. This publication states further “When Benjamin B. Warfield succeeded Hodge as professor of Theology at Princeton, he identified the Princeton position with that of the Bible itself and claimed that the church had always held to the Princeton particularities.” Custer’s comment therefore only applies from the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, or the beginning of the final and apostate Laodicean Church Age, Revelation 3:14-20.)

Dr Ruckman replies, his emphasis, as quoted in full by White, “Well, are they? If not, would you mind demonstrating why they are not?...why didn’t [Custer] list the chapter and verses in the Holy Bible to prove Ruckman was wrong?”

White responds to Dr Ruckman’s question in a note that consists essentially of outright evasion<sup>3 p 125</sup>, like much of his book. Emphases are his.

“The position espoused by Ruckman is so utterly unfounded...asking someone to **cite Bible** verses about an issue of **translation** is tremendously silly. The issue is one of language and time. English did not exist when the Bible was written...It is simply irrational to believe that a translation into a language that did not even exist in the days of Moses or Isaiah or the Lord Jesus should **define** the original **readings** and **meanings** of documents written half a world away in a completely different language. It would be like someone translating the Declaration of Independence into a strange dialect found amongst tribes in the South Pacific and then asserting that the form and meaning of the Declaration should be determined on the basis of **that** language rather than English.”

White has cited 252 verses of scripture about the “issue of translation.” See **Appendix, Table A1**. He does not regard these citations as “tremendously silly.” His opening

statement is therefore self-contradictory. He also claims repeatedly to have “*the original readings*” of scripture<sup>3 p 48, 125</sup>, at least with respect to the New Testament. So why is he as incapable as Custer in producing these “*original readings*” in order to refute “*the position espoused by Ruckman ...so utterly unfounded*”? The answer is one of sheer evasion.

White’s translation analogy is irrelevant, as he himself demonstrated<sup>3 p 75</sup> when he cited the King James translators<sup>26</sup>, “*As the King’s speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King’s speech...*” The King’s men clearly believed that they had “*the original readings and meanings of documents written half a world away in a completely different language.*” They compiled them in a BOOK that became the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.

And it is the Principal Author of that Book Who decides how to “*define*” those readings and meanings.

Because White forgets that, unlike any human document, such as “*the Declaration of Independence*” “*the word of God liveth and abideth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:23b and unlike the long-dead authors of the Declaration, the Author of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible has declared, “*I am he that liveth...and, behold, I am alive for evermore*” Revelation 1:18 and as the Psalmist says with respect to “*language and time,*” “*The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations*” Psalm 33:11.

God is not limited to the original languages in His desire to express “*the thoughts of his heart to all generations*” regardless of the ill-considered opinions of James White or Stewart Custer or anyone like them. “*The word of God is quick and powerful*” Hebrews 4:12a, now, in the form of the AV1611, as it always has been and always will be – as the AV1611, having superseded all its predecessors, faithful witnesses of “*the holy scriptures*” though they were, 2 Timothy 3:15a.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger has noted<sup>39 p 956</sup> – see comments on Revelation 17:8 in **Chapter 3**.

“*There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no ‘Dead Bible Society’ to translate it into “everyday English,” using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible [AV1611] to check us for errors.*”

James White could learn much from Dr Mrs Riplinger and her researches if he didn’t despise them both. (He would, no doubt, reject all of the above, however. Mere “*Bible verses*” could never take the place of ‘scholarship-onlyists,’ (like himself) when it came to determining what God *said* and what God *meant*, according to “*the holy scriptures.*”)

White<sup>3 p 112ff</sup> now focuses on Dr Ruckman’s critique of the NKJV<sup>112</sup>, insisting that “*Ruckman’s argumentation is circular at best, and often grossly flawed.*”

Because Dr Ruckman believes the AV1611 to be the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, White resorts to the facile expression that he set up earlier, “*The King James Bible Alone = The Word of God Alone.*”

He then states, his emphases.

“*The KJV has to be tested on the very same [unspecified] basis as any other translation, just as its translators believed and stated in the Preface. It is irrational to set it up as the*

*standard by divine fiat and then judge everything else by it, but this is exactly what Peter Ruckman does.”*

Almost half way through his book, White has yet to produce any unequivocal standard by which he or anyone else may judge *anything*.

His comment above indicates that the AV1611 cannot be believed as the pure word of God and nowhere in his book does he specify what can be believed as the pure word of God, from cover to cover, between two covers. In the opinion of James White, God has failed to preserve His word in that respect.

However, he has lied about the stance of the King James translators. See comments on the AV1611 Preface in **Chapter 4** and comments above on White’s apparent scorn for “*absolute religious certainty*,” i.e. belief in the AV1611 as “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21.

As Dr Smith has exhorted the reader.

*“Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews. Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...[S]tarve not yourselves...he setteth his word before us, to read it...”<sup>26</sup>*

White continues to ignore the exhortation. It will be interesting to see his reaction at “*the judgement seat of Christ*,” Romans 14:10.

He says specifically<sup>3 p 113</sup> of Dr Ruckman’s critique of the NKJV<sup>112 p 15-16</sup> that “*Dr Ruckman provides five passages of scripture that he alleges prove that the NKJV “covers up” sins in the Bible. He attempts to tie the NKJV to the “terrible” RSV of the National Council of Churches (guilt by association) by noting similarities in translation. All of this to arrive at his conclusion:*”

White inserts a passage in full from Dr Ruckman’s work as follows, author’s emphases.

*“These verses were perverted because the New King James Version was aimed at...a certain smooth, slick type of cultured intelligensia who had **thick** POCKETBOOKS. To protect this bunch of apostate “Fundamentalists,” the [NKJV] altered 1 Timothy 6:10...so that **the love of money** would NOT be the root of all evil.”*

White then asks, “*Does Dr Ruckman provide solid, meaningful arguments to back up such strong language?*”

In answer, White then comments on each of the five verses of scripture in turn, in order to denigrate the AV1611 readings and to justify the NKJV readings. They are 2 Corinthians 2:17, Romans 1:18, 25, 1 Thessalonians 5:22 and 1 Timothy 6:5.

Note that the NKJV, NIV and White’s NASV all read with the DR, JR, JB, NWT in Romans 1:18. They read with the JB, NWT in Romans 1:25, 2 Corinthians 2:17, 1 Thessalonians 5:22 and 1 Timothy 6:5. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

White clearly believes that God gave His words to Rome and Watchtower but not to the King’s men in all five references, even though Solomon warns that “*Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?*” Ecclesiastes 8:4.

Dr Ruckman writes<sup>1 p 404</sup> “*It is instructive to note that James White is much more concerned with the AV readings that deal with his sins (pp. 114-117). NOTE THAT HE*

*DEALS WITH THESE VERSES BEFORE HE DEALS WITH THE VERSES THAT EMPHASIZE THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST! You are to put on the fig leaf apron (Gen. 3) before you can deal with “Deity.”*”

Before addressing White’s comments on each of these verses, it should be noted in passing that:

- White has omitted to inform the reader of Dr Ruckman’s citations from Proverbs – see above – that have already established the NKJV’s “*guilt by association*” with the corrupt ASV-RSV readings of Alexandria.
- White omitted in his citation above the NKJV reading for 1 Timothy 6:10, i.e. “*For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil...*” which Dr Ruckman inserted in full.
- White also omitted the remainder of the extract from Dr Ruckman’s work, which goes on to include two “*solid, meaningful arguments*” to demonstrate the apostate nature of the NKJV, at least for Bible believers. The first is as follows, indicating that the NKJV *does* match the RSV in 1 Timothy 6:10, author’s emphases.

*“The [NKJV] adopted here the Alexandrian reading of the RSV of the National Council of Communist churches. BIRDS OF A FEATHER FLOCK TOGETHER.”*

This is the second, from Ecclesiastes 10:19b, demonstrating that bible corrupters, like the NKJV committee, have a particular eye towards *sales* and *revenue*.

*“Since “MONEY ANSWERETH ALL THINGS,” ...the final test of the authority for this new Rat’s Nest was found in a verse that dealt with INCOME. The Laodicean church was “increased with goods” [Revelation 3:17a] and knew not that it was POOR and wretched and miserable and naked and (above all!) BLIND. Just as blind as a bat.”*

White quotes from Dr Ruckman’s evaluation<sup>112 p 15</sup> of the NKJV reading for 2 Corinthians 2:17 as follows, author’s emphasis. The quotation reads in part, “*It is all right to corrupt the word of God as long as you don’t “peddle” it.*”

White comments.

*“The NKJV simply translates the Greek text differently than the KJV, which has “corrupt the word of God” ...The Greek term used here...is “kapeleuontes,” which literally means a peddler...One source [Louw and Nida, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains] defines it, “to engage in retail business, with the implication of deceptiveness and greedy motives – to ‘peddle for profit’...Therefore we see that, in reality, the KJV rendering is inferior to all the modern translations...It is obvious therefore, that the NKJV translators are not seeking to give anyone an excuse to “corrupt” the Word of God, but are instead doing just as the KJV translators before them; seeking faithfully to translate the Word of God into English. Surely if the KJV translators were alive today they would gladly admit that “peddle” is a better translation than “corrupt” and would adopt it themselves.”*

White then launches into a tirade against Dr Ruckman and bible believers in general, his emphases.

*“Nothing we have said is slightly relevant to the KJV Only advocate who follows the thinking of Peter Ruckman...What “kapeleuontes” meant to Paul or the original audience is irrelevant. Greek means nothing. Greek lexicons mean nothing. The verse says “corrupt” in the KJV, and hence it must mean corrupt. Period, end of discussion. God de-*

*terminated what it meant when He brought the AV 1611 into existence and that's it. Facts are to be ignored; those who present the facts are to be insulted, belittled and identified as "Alexandrians." The tight circularity of the position is almost painful to behold..."*

Once again, White denies that the AV1611 is the pure word of God and once again, he fails to specify any 'bible' which is the pure word of God but nevertheless, he insists that he is one of "those who present the facts" with respect to 2 Corinthians 2:17.

But has he?

Dr Ruckman responds as follows<sup>1 p 76ff</sup>, his emphases.

*"When Jimmy hits that terror of all terrors (2 Cor. 2:17)...he justifies the perverted accounts ("peddle") by deliberately omitting three-fourths of the definitions for the Greek word "kapeleuontes" found in Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Omissions mark Satanic scholarship.*

*"After telling you the AV reading ("**corrupt**") is **inferior** "to all the modern translations" his only proof is that "one source says..." Well, why be "monolithic," stupid? Let's try another one. But before we give it, note this remarkable assertion based on nothing but White's horror of the verse as it stands in the AV. He says "peddle is a better translation," and if the KJV translators were alive today they would gladly admit it. Then, still unable to shake the conviction the verse got him under, as it stood in the AV, he limps off the stage by saying that if you follow the "thinking of Peter Ruckman" you ignore **Greek and Greek Lexicons**...*

*"No Greek lexicon, eh Jimmy? How is this; "TO CORRUPT OR ADULTERATE" (The Analytical Greek Lexicon, Zondervan Pub. Co., 1970, p 212). Ruckman ignores FACTS, does he Jimmy? It is "almost PAINFUL TO BEHOLD," is it Jimmy? Well, you little foulmouthed, lying fakir, how about this one: "Deceitful...false...to misrepresent a thing...to FALSIFY THE WORD (as the kapelos purchases pure wine and then ADULTERATES IT WITH WATER)" (Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. 3, 1965, pp. 603, 605)...*

*"Paul is talking about "good, godly" scholars with "**good words**" and "**fair speeches**" using "**cunning craftiness**," [Romans 16:18, Ephesians 4:14] etc. to **corrupt** what God **wrote**, and what He said. White, in his blind stupidity, forgot that **apocryphal books** had been written before Paul wrote, and were being written while he wrote. And the greatest **corruptions** of the New Testament which no one "peddled" [i.e. no-one "peddled" the New Testament] occurred between AD 50 and 190 while the New Testament was being completed. Those are historical facts known to every student of manuscript evidence on this earth...*

*"Now we read the final authority: Psalm 14:1, 73:8; Jeremiah 8:5, 23:36; Daniel 11:32; Matthew 7:17-18, 12:33.*

*"Look at the context of 2 Corinthians, chapter 2, instead of a liar who would lie for fifteen cents.*

1. Satan (vs. 11)
2. **Words** that are preached (vs. 12)
3. The word of God (vs. 17)
4. **Words** that are WRITTEN (3:1)
5. Words found in **epistles** (3:2-3)

## 6. THE NEW TESTAMENT (3:6)

*“Nobody was selling anything. No one was “peddling” God’s words. They were corrupting them.”*

Dr Holland has these comments on 2 Corinthians 2:17<sup>55 p 187-8</sup>, his emphases.

*“The Greek word “kapeleuontes” does carry the meaning of a **peddler** or **retailer**. However, it connotes one who sells with **deceit**, a **corrupter**. Dr Walter Bauer states that the word came to mean “to adulterate.” Dr Joseph Thayer agrees, adding, “But as peddlers were in the habit of adulterating their commodities for the sake of gain... [the word] was also used as synonymous with **to corrupt**, **to adulterate**.” Likewise, Dr Gerhard Kittel states that “kapeleuontes,” “also means...to falsify the word (as the kapelos purchases pure wine and then dilutes it with water) by making additions...This refers to the false Gospel of the Judaizers.”*

Note that the competing readings in 2 Corinthians 2:17 do not impinge on either Thayer’s Unitarianism or Kittel’s anti-Semitism. The meanings that they give for “kapeleuontes” should not therefore incur the bias about which Dr Mrs Riplinger has warned<sup>14 p 601</sup>. See comments about Erasmus’s Greek New Testament in **Chapter 4**.

Dr Holland continues.

*“The early church fathers understood the verse to refer to those who corrupt God’s word. Athanasius (373 AD) wrote, “Let them therefore be anathema to you, because they have ‘corrupted the word of truth’.” Gregory of Nazianzus (390 AD) alludes to 2 Corinthians 2:17, Isaiah 1:22 and Psalm 54:15, using the word “corrupt”...*

*“Dr James White...makes an interesting claim concerning this verse. He writes, p 114, “Surely if the KJV translators were alive today they would gladly admit that ‘peddle’ is a better translation than ‘corrupt,’ and would adopt it themselves.” If this is true, how would one explain the notes of Dr John Bois, one of the translators of the KJV? In his notes on 2 Corinthians 2:17, Dr Bois writes, “Ibid. v. 17. “kapeleuontes”” [being a retail dealer, playing tricks, corrupting]...kapelos is derived...by corrupting and adulterating wine.” Apparently, the translators of the KJV were aware of the meaning of this word.”*

See also Wilkinson’s remarks under **Early Conspirators and Corrupters** about the prevalence of 1<sup>st</sup> century corrupters of scripture.

White then quotes Dr Ruckman’s comment on Romans 1:18 in the NKJV. The opening sentence is, author’s emphasis, *“It is proper to **hold** the word of God in unrighteousness as long as you aren’t guilty of “suppressing it.”*”

White maintains that, his emphasis, *“The Greek term is “katechonton,” which means “to hold down, to suppress, to hold fast or firmly”...The KJV rendering...is still found to be inferior to the modern versions. “To suppress” is a perfectly acceptable translation of the Greek term, and it vividly displays the action of sinful man in **suppressing** the truth of God (which every man has) in unrighteousness. The plain translation “hold” does not express this action very clearly at all.”*

Not even Vine<sup>70</sup> explicitly includes “to suppress” as a meaning for “katechonton.” This term appears to be an interpretation. Moreover, anyone who incurred the wrath of God for ‘suppressing’ the truth would be acting unrighteously by definition and therefore the expression **“in unrighteousness”** would be redundant.

But the expression is needed if **“hold the truth”** is the correct rendering, because it is possible to **“hold the truth”** in righteousness. Consider how Paul exhorts Timothy.

**“Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus”** 2 Timothy 1:13.

So White is wrong when he maintains that the modern translations “accurately render the Scriptures from Greek into English...[to] give the best translation of the Greek term that is possible [with] no conspiracies...just as the KJV translators would have wanted it.”

They clearly didn’t want “the best translation” that White chose and Dr Ruckman explains why<sup>1 p 79ff</sup>, his emphases.

“[White] says that “suppress” should be “preferred” because...the KJV reading here “is still found to be inferior to the modern translations.” The truth is the “alternative reading” (AV) scared the pants off him. Anyone could prove that he was “holding the truth in unrighteousness” but who could prove that he or his buddies were “suppressing” truth? No one. **That was a safe reading**, so the scared sissy says: “it vividly displays the action of sinful man in **suppressing** the truth of God (which every man has) in unrighteousness.” Note! **He excluded all of his buddies!**

**“Three lies:** (1) Every man certainly does **not** have the truth of God. Look at the passages (vss. 21, 23, 25-26, 28). Now look at John 10:26; Mark 12:24; and Isaiah 59:14. Not even the natural revelation of God in nature (Ps. 119; Rom. 1:19-20) is “HELD” by sinners, nor is it “suppressed.” **It is ignored.** (2) There is no “action” involved yet. There is no **action** when a man mentally suppressed the truth in his own conscience, or mind (see vs. 28). The man is **unrighteous** while **holding** “the truth of God.” (3) “Sinful man” was inserted because White had said (for 271 pages) **that every Bible perverter on every twentieth century Bible committee (ASV, NASV, TEV, NWT, NEB, RSV, NRSV, NIV, and NKJV) was a godly man who was trying to preserve God’s word accurately.** That obviously excludes “sinful man.” They were not “sinful”...

“This time [White’s] “standard” for finding out the “intent of the original author” was **emotional panic**. His **heart** responded against the truth (Prov. 18:1-3), for “**as he thinketh in his heart, so is he**” (Prov. 23:7): not his **HEAD**. All Scholarship Only advocates are “**heady and high minded**” (2 Tim. 3:4) [compare Psalm 73:21 and Job 12:2, 20:6].

“Here are the four AV “variants” White rejected because they exposed his dirty rotten life which had been dedicated to justifying the sins of Bible-perverting scamps:

1. “To hold in a firm GRASP”
2. “To keep or **RETAIN**” (not “suppress”)
3. “To come into full **POSSESSION**”
4. “To have in **FULL** and secure **POSSESSION**”

“Authorized Version, 1611: **“WHO HOLD THE TRUTH IN UNRIGHTEOUSNESS”**

“An Alexandrian always chooses a “variant” that will **best cover up his sins.**”

The “variants” that Dr Ruckman lists match the primary meanings that Vine gives – see above – namely, “to hold firmly, hold fast.”

So White is lying again when he states, “This is all irrelevant to Dr Ruckman. Romans 1:18 says “hold the truth” because the AV 1611 says so, Greek notwithstanding.”

White now moves to 1 Thessalonians 5:22, where the AV1611 has “**Abstain from all appearance of evil.**” Dr Ruckman’s comments read in part as follows, author’s emphasis.

*“It is proper to **appear** to [be] doing evil as long as you don’t actually DO evil. See the RSV reading of the NCCC in Falwell-Nelson’s “Bible” in 1 Thessalonians 5:22, “abstain from every form of evil” (NKJV)...”*

White naturally insists that the NKJV, RSV reading is superior to that of the AV1611, his emphases.

*“The word... “eidos” can mean “form, outward appearance,” but it can also mean “kind.” The NKJV captures both possibilities with “form,” while the KJV’s rendering limits us to only one of the two possible meanings of the term. Again, the error of Dr Ruckman’s argument is plainly seen by simply reversing it: is the KJV trying to say it is OK to actually **do** evil as long as it does not **appear** that you are doing so? Of course not. The idea that there is some...conspiracy involved in trying to twist and change the teaching of Scripture is a common element of KJV Only writing...”*

“Conspiracy” is actually “a common element” amongst those that bible believers write against. See Burgon’s remarks and Wilkinson’s treatise in the **Summary and Introduction**.

White’s argument disintegrates on examination of the context of 1 Thessalonians 5:22. The preceding clause in verse 21 states, **“hold fast that which is good.”**

This statement covers abstinence from “every form of evil” (and White’s proposition that the AV1611 might be taken to imply that “it is OK to actually **do** evil...”) but not **“all appearance of evil.”** Verse 22 must therefore read as it does in the AV1611 and not as in the NKJV.

Interestingly, the NKJV agrees with the AV1611 in verse 21, by translating “*katecho*” as “hold fast.” “*Katecho*” was the same word that White insisted should be translated as “*suppress*” in Romans 1:18. See above. In fact, the NKJV agrees with the AV1611 in each of the other four passages in which “*katecho*” is found<sup>71</sup>, Romans 7:6, Hebrews 3:6, 14, 10:23 or in five verses out of six, overall.

Only in Romans 1:18 does the NKJV resort to the interpretative rendering “*suppress*.”

This observation certainly lends weight to Dr Ruckman’s conclusion above.

*“An Alexandrian always chooses a “variant” that will **best cover up his sins**.”*

Vine<sup>70</sup> on this occasion agrees with White with respect to 1 Thessalonians 5:22.

He states *“Eidos...has a somewhat different significance in 1 Thess. 5:22, in the exhortation “Abstain from every form of evil”...not “appearance,” A.V. This meaning was common in the papyri, the Greek writings of the closing centuries, B.C., and the New Testament era...”*

Vine’s comment is most revealing. Its significance will be considered in more detail later.

Dr Ruckman responds<sup>1 p 83-4</sup>, his emphases.

*“This time [1 Thessalonians 5:22] there are no “textual variants” so, according to White’s rule (which he set up himself)<sup>3 p 125\*</sup> he has to accept the reading (edios) but he doesn’t dare, for after all, his object...was to get read of **one** Book. So he says the NKJV should be accepted here instead of the AV [because]...The NKJV reading “every kind [form] of evil” is “more inclusive” than **“Abstain from all APPEARANCE of evil.”**”*

**“Lied again.** There isn’t an English dictionary in print that would make “form” **include** all appearances although appearances **can include all forms, plus suspected forms.**



**“Appearance” covers everything; covers good that can be evil spoken of (Rom. 14:16), and “form” doesn’t...Romans 14:16 covers good that looks like evil...If all you did was abstain from “FORMS” you could sit on the curb and drink water out of a Four Roses’ whiskey bottle. Such action is not “evil.” But it **appears** to be evil...**”

**\*“In the vast majority of the writings of Paul (or any other writer of scripture) we can determine exactly what was originally written because there are no textual variants to hinder us from doing so!”**

Dr Ruckman has these additional comments<sup>113 p 101-2</sup> on 1 Thessalonians 5:22, his emphases.

*“The Holy Bible is saying that avoiding “evil” – any FORM or any KIND of evil – does no good if you fail to avoid **appearing** to be evil or **appear** to be doing evil...”*

*“This abortion of the truth was first slipped into English Bibles by Westcott and Hort back in 1881...between nine and twenty-one years before the **King James Bible** showed up; the correct reading is found in the **Great Bible**, the **Geneva Bible**, and the **Bishops’ Bible**. Tyndale, clear back eighty-six years before 1611, had a grasp of the “original Greek” that was denied to the apostate corrupters of the RV, RSV, NRSV, NKJV, ASV, NASV, and NIV...He says you are to “abstain from all SUSPICIOUS things.” That is **exactly** the “intent of the original author.” The new versions give you the intent of a **backslidden, carnal Christian** who wants freedom to do ANYTHING as long as it isn’t “evil”...*

*“With [the new versions], any Christian boy could let his hair grow to his shoulders [like Absalom, 2 Samuel 14:26], put a ring in one ear, and then dress up in baggy pants and put on a T-shirt saying “Life is a Beach”; and as long as he is not **doing** “evil,” he is all right.”*

Though the brother **“clean escaped from them who live in error”** 2 Peter 2:18b that **“stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak”** Romans 14:21b through the longhair’s unscriptural appearance is clearly *not* all right. It is instructive that the RV, RSV, NRSV, ASV, NASV and the NIV omit the words **“or is offended, or is made weak”** along with the JB, NWT and NKJV disputes them in its footnote. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“The Greek word here...can mean “external **appearance**,” just as quickly as “form” or “kind.” In 2 Corinthians 5:7, it is used as “form” in the sense of “sight” and **“perception”** – i.e. **what APPEARS before your eyes** (Analytical Greek Lexicon, Zondervan, 1970, p. 117).”*

Dr Ruckman’s comments show that White has not consulted enough lexicons. Perhaps he stopped as soon as he found some that contradicted the AV1611.

His quote from Dr Ruckman’s work on Romans 1:25 reads in part<sup>112 p 15</sup>, with Dr Ruckman’s emphases.

*“It is all right to **change the truth of God** into a LIE as long as you don’t “exchange” it for something...”*

White objects that, his emphasis, *“The term translated “changed” in the KJV...is the word “metallasso,” which means to “exchange” one thing for something else. Another source notes that in translating this term at Romans 1:25 “it is essential to avoid anything which might mean ‘to change something into.’ It is the substitution of one thing for another, hence ‘exchange’ rather than ‘change’ is the correct gloss.” This makes perfect sense: men cannot change God’s truth...God’s truth remains inviolable no matter what*

man does. But man can exchange God's truth for "the lie," as Paul said, and can engage in the perverted behaviour that is the subject of the passage..."

Dr Ruckman responds<sup>1 p 81-3</sup>, his emphases.

"[Metallasso] in Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* Vol. 1, p 259) has, as its primary meaning, "to ALTER as in to CHANGE something"...

"The *Theological Dictionary* says "the terrible PERVERSION (not "exchange")...of the natural in the SEXUAL field [see Romans 1:26]...for the sinful PERVERSION OF FACTS (!! in the religious..."

"Spiritual apostasy is **fornication and adultery**...Now, go back and look at 2 Corinthians 2:17 – see that "adulteration"? The old **black-backed**, 66-calibre "archaic" Elizabethan English simply shredded the Scholars' Union with two words: "Changed" and "Corrupt." It "had their number" – 666.

"Those two words describe every English version on the market since 1800 that was fabricated to replace the King James Bible. They were written by men who denied their own Greek dictionaries when those works revealed their own sins of jealousy, covetousness, pride and unbelief."

The NKJV that White is defending in this chapter has "**changed the truth of God into a lie**" in several related passages, as do the NIV and White's NASV - see remarks in *Chapter 3*.

In Deuteronomy 23:17, the AV1611 has "**whore**" and "**sodomite**," the NKJV has "ritual prostitute" and "perverted one." The NIV and White's NASV have "temple prostitute" and "cult prostitute" respectively for both terms.

In 1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:46, 2 Kings 23:7, the AV1611 has "**sodomites**," the NKJV has "perverted persons." The NIV has "male shrine prostitutes" and the NASV has "male cult prostitutes" except in 1 Kings 22:46, where it reads "**sodomites**," correctly but *inconsistently*.

Only the AV1611 *unequivocally* – and rightly – condemns whoredom and sodomy in each of these passages. The other versions fail to do so because they "**changed the truth of God into a lie**" and "**worshipped and served the creature**," scholarship, "**more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen**" and Who declared "**thy word is truth**" John 17:17.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger has observed<sup>96 p 68</sup> "Young people desperately need the bible's warning that the "sodomite" (KJV) is engaged in a potentially deadly activity. "Shrine" or "cult prostitution" (NIV, NASV et al.) is archaic, it is not a translation of the Hebrew but a subjective interpretation of its meaning."

White completes his objection to Dr Ruckman's analysis of the NKJV with a quote<sup>112 p 16</sup> that reads in part as follows, author's emphasis, with respect to 1 Timothy 6:5, where the reading at issue is "**supposing that gain is godliness**" in the AV1611.

"It is all right to substitute financial gain for **godliness** or to accept financial income as a **proof** of godliness as long as you don't think that godliness is a MEANS of gain. See in 1 Timothy 6:5, "Useless wrangling of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, who suppose that godliness is a means of gain..." (NKJV)..."

White for once believes that "there is nothing wrong with the KJV rendering." But he hastens to add "but there is nothing wrong with the NKJV rendering, either." His expla-

nation, his emphases, is that “*prideful men with corrupt minds...think that godliness is a means of gain – they will **act the part** in order to **reap the benefits**...The idea that bringing out the **instrumentality** of “godliness” to bring about “gain” in the NKJV is somehow a cover for sin is simply unreasonable.*”

It is White’s comment on 1 Timothy 6:5 that “*is simply unreasonable*” because he has misunderstood the AV1611. Moreover, given that the NKJV uses the term “godliness,” its reading is self-contradictory. If the “godliness” is a pretence for the purpose of ‘reaping benefits,’ as White claims it is in order to justify the NKJV reading, then it is not “godliness” at all. It is *hypocrisy*.

The AV1611 reading, correctly, is aimed at *saved* individuals who equate perceived success in the ministry, e.g. large church attendances, with being “**a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ**” Ephesians 4:13b.

Of whom the Lord says through the Apostle John, “*...thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked*” Revelation 3:17b.

As Dr Ruckman’s comment indicates, the “**men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth**” are not engaged in any kind of ‘acting.’ He notes further<sup>16 p 124</sup> with respect to 1 Timothy 6:5 that “*real godliness brings persecution (2 Tim. 3:12). The present-day reading (EVERY BIBLE ON THE MARKET BUT AN AV FROM 1611) has no meaning at all...*”

Dr Ruckman responds to White as follows, author’s emphases<sup>1 p 282</sup>.

“*First Timothy 6:5...must be a reference to **somebody else** who just “acts the part” of a godly person. That is, he just **acts** “godly” to “get gain.” Of course, that is not what **any** Greek text says. That is an original innovation designed to cover up the sins of carnal, materialistic Conservatives who “**suppose that gain is godliness**,” (1 Tim. 6:5)...*

“*The Greek word [eusebeia, “godliness”] is found **eight times** in 1 Timothy (2:2, 3:16, 4:7, 8, 6:3, 5-6, and 11). **The word in every Greek manuscript in every extant copy of 1 Timothy (in all eight places) is NEVER a reference to anyone ACTING “godly.”** First Timothy 6:5, in every Greek manuscript extant, is aimed directly at a **carnal, materialistic Christian** who assumes that his income from book sales or his school enrolment or his course and lands, or his church attendance or his bank account are **PROOF** that he is “godly” and “spiritual.” Paul’s order to the New Testament Christian was to get away from this class of people: **ditch ’em**...*

“*Jimmy added “**act the part**” to the verse to force it to read “who suppose that **acting** godly is a means of gain,” or “imagining that **acting** godliness is a means of gain,” etc. No such reading can be found in **any** Greek manuscript. **The reading is a lie.** Jimmy lied again...He made no attempt to locate **any** “original reading.”*”

Finishing his comments on Dr Ruckman’s evaluation of the NKJV, White concludes<sup>3 p 117</sup> that, “*Dr Ruckman views his mere assertions as actual evidence, when such is surely not the case.*”

Dr Ruckman responds<sup>1 p 85</sup>, his emphases.

“*There are eighty-seven pages of “mere assertions” in White’s book before you get to page 185.*

“*These eighty-seven pages (pp. 19-48, 127-185) of “mere assertions” came from believing the hallucinations and illusions of Westcott and Hort which were never based on **ac-***

*tual fact, one time in a hundred years (see pp. 138-140, 174-175). They are “moonshine” from 1880... White did **nothing** to prove his assertions on conflated readings, textual variants, text-types, the motives of modern translators, the manuscript and patristic evidence (see pp. 169-176) behind the AV readings, “expansions of piety,” concise vs. fuller texts, etc. He just parroted Hort, Nestle, Aland and Metzger. “Actual evidence,” see above, is as foreign to James White as Nintendo is to a Mongolian.”*

White’s sources for justifying the NKJV readings in the five verses considered consist of Greek-English lexicons by several authors who include Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has this observation<sup>114</sup>, this author’s emphases.

*“My upcoming new book, **Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers: The Voice of Strangers**, is subtitled, **The Men Behind the Smokescreen, Burning Bibles Word by Word...It documents the heresies held by Strong, Thayer, Liddell, Scott, Moulton, Milligan, Gesenius, Brown, Driver, Briggs, Bauer, Danker, Arndt, Gingrich and others. Their beliefs are shocking. The Bible teaches that “man’s wisdom” is “not” to be our tool for Bible study; spiritual things must be compared within one’s own Holy Bible.***

*““[N]ot in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual” (1 Cor. 2:13).*

*“Lexicons are dictionaries which purport to ‘define,’ in English, the ‘original’ Greek and Hebrew words of the Bible. **They are all marred by corrupt Greek and Hebrew texts. They define words based on subjective analysis of secular, often pagan, usage.** There are seminal lexical works for Greek and Hebrew, from which all subsequent abridged lexicons are derived. **These exhaustive and early works were all written by unbelievers with the express purpose of undermining the words in the Holy Bible to which the common man has access.**”*

Recall that when Vine gives the meaning of the word “*eidos*”, as found in 1 Thessalonians 5:22, he substitutes “*form*,” NKJV for “**appearance**,” AV1611 and declares that “*This meaning was common in the papyri, the Greek writings of the closing centuries, B.C., and the New Testament era...*”

Precisely as Dr Mrs Riplinger has highlighted. She continues.

*“**Kittel’s Theological Dictionary of the New Testament** underlies most Greek lexicons available today. It was used in the writing of the NIV. **Gerhard Kittel was Hitler’s propaganda high priest** and was “discredited by his ties with the Nazis, as reflected in his anti-Semitic tract *Die Judenfrage* (1934). Arrested by French occupation forces in 1945 and imprisoned for seventeen months, he was not allowed to return to his university post or to receive a pension.*

*“**The Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament by Walter Bauer** is another lexicon produced by a **Nazi-philosophy sympathizer**. Bauer’s heretical views, expressed in his book, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, include the notion that those early Christians who spread the New Testament were ‘heretics’ and pagan philosophers held the ‘truth.’ Even the secular Wikipedia states that “**Bauer’s conclusions contradicted nearly 1600 years of essentially uncontested church history** and thus were met with much skepticism among Christians” ([http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter\\_Bauer](http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Bauer)). Various editions of Bauer’s work have been edited or translated by **liberals such as Danker, Arndt and Gingrich...Danker was tried for heresy** by his own liberal denomination and lost his teaching position (See his own admission in his books, *No Room in the Brother-**

hood, and Under Investigation). *The impact of Danker's heretical theology (regarding salvation) on his lexicon's definitions, was the subject of an article in the Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society (Autumn, 2004).*"

White mentions other lexical authors whom Dr Mrs Riplinger does not explicitly mention but she warns, "*It must be remembered that all current lexicons are based strictly upon these [seminal lexical] works and are therefore just as corrupt. Just because a lexicon's author has not been mentioned here does not mean that his lexicon is uncorrupted.*"

Dr Ruckman has alluded to Kittel's *Theological Dictionary* in his comments on Romans 1:25 but he emphasises that it is the English 1611 Authorised Holy Bible that "*shredded the Scholars' Union,*" not Kittel's dictionary. The simple fact that lexicons may contradict each other immediately disqualifies them from the position of final authority in determining the biblical meanings of words used in the scriptures.

As Dr Hills has noted<sup>8 p 148</sup>, "*What one scholar grants, another takes away,*" consistent with Dr Mrs Riplinger's admonition above, "*spiritual things must be compared within one's own Holy Bible.*"

White concludes this chapter<sup>3 p 117-121</sup> with several criticisms levelled at Dr Ruckman's exposition entitled "*The Creed of the Alexandrian Cult*<sup>1 p 361</sup>."

The statements of the 'creed' may be found in most issues of the *Bible Believer's Bulletin*. It is reproduced here for reference.

#### **"The Creed of the Alexandrian Cult**

1. *There is no final authority but God.*
2. *Since God is a Spirit, there is no final authority that can be seen, heard, read, felt, or handled.*
3. *Since all books are material, there is no book on this earth that is the final and absolute authority on what is right and what is wrong: what constitutes truth and what constitutes error.*
4. *There WAS a series of writings one time which, IF they had all been put into a BOOK as soon as they were written the first time WOULD HAVE constituted an infallible and final authority by which to judge truth and error.*
5. *However, this series of writings was lost, and the God who inspired them was unable to preserve their content through Bible-believing Christians at Antioch (Syria) where the first Bible teachers were (Acts 13:1), and where the first missionary trip originated (Acts 13:1-6), and where the word "Christian" originated (Acts 11:26).*
6. *So, God chose to ALMOST preserve them through Gnostics and philosophers from Alexandria, Egypt, even though God called His Son OUT of Egypt (Matt. 2), Jacob OUT of Egypt (Gen. 49), Israel OUT of Egypt (Exod. 15), and Joseph's bones OUT of Egypt (Exod. 13).*
7. *So, there are two streams of Bibles: the most accurate-though, of course, there is no final, absolute authority for determining truth and error: it is a matter of "preference" - are the Egyptian translations from Alexandria, Egypt, that are "almost the originals," although not quite.*
8. *The most inaccurate translations were those that brought about the German Reformation (Luther, Zwingli, Boehler, Zinzendorf, Spener, etc.) and the world-wide*

*missionary movement of the English speaking people: the Bible that Sunday, Torrey, Moody, Finney, Spurgeon, Whitefield, Wesley, and Chapman used.*

9. *But we can “tolerate” these, if those who believe in them will tolerate US. After all, since there is NO ABSOLUTE AND FINAL AUTHORITY that anyone can read, teach, preach, or handle, the whole thing is a matter of “PREFERENCE.” You may prefer what you prefer, and we will prefer what we prefer. Let us live in peace, and if we cannot agree on anything or everything, let us all agree on one thing: THERE IS NO FINAL, ABSOLUTE, WRITTEN AUTHORITY OF GOD ANYWHERE ON THIS EARTH.*

*“This is the creed of the Alexandrian Cult.”*

White acknowledges the truth of point 1 but then makes the false statement, his emphasis, that *“Dr Ruckman...seemingly [thinks] that to believe that God is the final absolute authority means that God cannot **communicate** with final and absolute authority, which does not logically follow.”*

White has blatantly misrepresented Dr Ruckman at the very start of his critique<sup>115</sup>.

*“Dr. Ruckman stands for the absolute authority of the Authorized Version and offers no apology to any recognized scholar anywhere for his stand. In addition to preaching the gospel and teaching the Bible, Dr. Ruckman has produced a comprehensive collection of apologetic and polemic literature and resources supporting the authority of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures.”*

Dr Ruckman’s stance is clearly that the AV1611 is the means by which God *does* communicate *“with final and absolute authority.”* White obviously rejects that stance but the accusation that he levels at Dr Ruckman is patently false.

White then attacks Dr Ruckman’s point 2. He says it is *“untrue”* because *“God is able to communicate His truth [undefined, as usual with James White] to man...through creation (the law of God written upon the heart)...in Scripture [undefined, as usual with James White] and most fully in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, God incarnate.”*

White has now shifted from *“final and absolute authority”* to *“God’s truth”* which he fails to identify. He also fails to define how the Lord Jesus Christ is revealed to man apart from *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21, given that now *“we walk by faith, not by sight”* 2 Corinthians 5:7.

And as Peter says of the Lord Jesus Christ, *“Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory”* 1 Peter 1:8.

It is *“the scriptures”* which testify of the Lord Jesus Christ, John 5:39 but White has not unequivocally identified *“the scriptures”* anywhere in his book so none of the means by which he declares *“God is able to communicate His truth to man”* amounts to anything *“that can be seen, heard, read, felt, or handled.”*

So White’s objections to Dr Ruckman’s point 2 are without foundation.

White describes Dr Ruckman’s point 3 as *“untrue”* because, his emphases, *“Ruckman is attempting to focus on a **particular** book not in the sense of “the Scriptures,” but in the sense of...a particular **rendering** of the Scriptures [with “Scriptures” undefined, as usual with James White].”*

White's statement above is a lie, as a perusal of any of Dr Ruckman's works will demonstrate<sup>16 p 270</sup>, e.g. "*The AV was GIVEN to us by God...we have the "HOLY SCRIPTURES."* I have a copy right here on my desk."

White continues.

*"Ruckman is driving toward asserting that unless one believes in inspired, inerrant translations of the Scriptures [undefined again], one cannot have any "kind of absolute authority" at all. Note the logical error: any level of uncertainty regarding textual matters (i.e. textual variants) means that one has no final authority."*

Note the further illogical omissions, besides White's omission of what actually constitutes "the Scriptures."

- White can only dismiss Dr Ruckman's point 3 as "untrue" if he can produce a book, which is "the final and absolute authority." He does not and indeed cannot.
- He fails to cite any "final authority" for resolving "textual variants," leaving the reader precisely where he started with Dr Ruckman's point 3.

White then continues with a totally irrelevant illustration of launching a rocket. Dr Ruckman's point 3 is concerned with *books*, not NASA's space programme.

But White then concludes, his emphasis, "*we can have an absolute and final authority in Scripture without having THE "one and only English translation" delivered to us via angelic messenger."*

White's statement contains another lie. None of Dr Ruckman's works imply the intervention of an "angelic messenger" as part of God's providential preservation of the scriptures as the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible<sup>8 p 155-157, 16 p 270ff</sup>. See also Dr Vance's analysis under *The Revision Conspiracy*.

Once again, White fails to produce his "absolute and final authority in Scripture" but he then contradicts himself in his final statement on Dr Ruckman's point 3.

*"God's authority in Scripture [undefined] is not in the least bit diminished by controversies about translating Scripture [undefined] into English (or any other language)."*

Not even by "translating that text from a rich foreign tongue into our less rich English tongue"<sup>3 p vi?</sup> Surely by definition, an 'inferior' translation cannot convey "God's authority" as powerfully to the (educated) reader as the "rich foreign" 'original'?

Moreover, White has affirmed<sup>3 p 125</sup> that "*English did not exist when the Bible was written...It is simply irrational to believe that a translation into a language that did not even exist in the days of Moses or Isaiah or the Lord Jesus should **define** the original **readings** and **meanings** of documents written half a world away in a completely different language."*

But unless the translation does *exactly that*, how can "God's authority in Scripture" be conveyed from one language to another without being "*in the least bit diminished by controversies about translating Scripture*"? Surely, for bible critics, if such controversies exist, they can only exacerbate the inferiority of the final (translated) result, already disadvantaged by the discrepancy in 'richness' between the donor and receiver languages?

Unlike Dr Hills<sup>3 p 85</sup>, White does not "*seem to have thought through the matter to its conclusion.*" However, his objections to Dr Ruckman's point 3 are also groundless.

With respect to Dr Ruckman's point 4, White asserts that "*the logical conclusion of Peter Ruckman's position is that there was a "re-inspiration" of the biblical text between 1604 and 1611, giving the KJV the same status as "revelation" that was held by the autographs themselves.*"

Concerning "*the autographs themselves,*" White is simply reiterating the unsubstantiated conjectures of Hodge and Warfield. See the comments on Revelation 22:19 in **Chapter 4**. Dr Ruckman's point 4 has nothing to do with anything that happened between 1604 and 1611. It is addressing Alexandrian conjectures and White has evaded this issue.

Once again, in discussing this point, White tries to convince the reader of the "*small amount of textual variation in the manuscript tradition.*" See the lengthy discussion in **Chapter 3** on White's New Testament Text that is supposedly "98.33 percent pure" and founded on the "great treasure" Codex Sinaiticus and "*another great codex,*" namely Vaticanus. It should be remembered that Dean Burgon exposed White's lie in this respect well over a century ago and that subsequent researchers have repeatedly vindicated Burgon's extensive findings.

White contradicts Dr Ruckman's point 5 with the statement that, his emphases, "*God was able to preserve their content...through Christians everywhere in the world, at Antioch as well as Alexandria, Jerusalem Rome, etc. The means God used historically does not fit Dr Ruckman's view of things and hence is dismissed in favor of the "inspired translation" theory.*"

See comments at the conclusion of **Chapter 3** for White's vague and speculative assessment on the preservation of the scriptures. The scriptures were *not* preserved in Alexandria. They were *corrupted* under the pretence of *correcting* them. See comments under **White's Introduction** and Burgon's evaluation<sup>13 p 323</sup>.

Once again, the truth "*does not fit*" James White's "*view of things.*"

As for an "*inspired translation*" or more accurately, one "*given by inspiration of God*" 2 Timothy 3:16, has White never considered either Acts 2:6-21 or Acts 22:1-21, in 'the original,' whether written or spoken?

Significantly, he has evaded *the scriptures* that Dr Ruckman cited in point 5.

White further evades the scriptures that Dr Ruckman cites in point 6, about which White complains that, his emphasis, "*Dr Ruckman provides no evidence that "Gnostics" had anything to do with the production of manuscripts associated with Alexandria. This is a mere assertion without historical facts to back it up. It is also untrue that God "almost" preserved the Scriptures. He preserved them but in a way different than Dr Ruckman would have liked.*"

Not in any "way" that White is able to identify in his entire book. See comments above.

His statement that "*Dr Ruckman provides no evidence that "Gnostics" had anything to do with the production of manuscripts associated with Alexandria etc.*" is a lie.

Dr Ruckman provided the evidence in the form of one complete chapter in a book<sup>33 Chapter 4</sup> published 7 years before White's, a section of a second book<sup>8 p 330-1</sup> published 13 years before White's and two chapters in another book<sup>18 Chapters 4, 5</sup> published 25 years before White's book appeared.

Part of Dr Ruckman's evidence reads as follows, his emphases, with more detailed sources referenced<sup>18 p 55-60, 116-9</sup>.



*“Origen was obsessed with Philosophy. He was **never** a Bible literalist. He carried a regular camp full of shorthand experts, stenographers, and writers with him to use for purposes of correcting the Bible...This man is fully equipped to manufacture “bibles,” alter manuscripts, or invent manuscripts, and his approach to the word of the Living God is, “If I don’t agree with it, I’ve got better sense than the Lord who wrote it, or the Christians who preserved it.” This man spent a lifetime in Alexandria and Caesarea, and both these cities produced corrupt manuscripts **following his sojourning** in them...*

*“[Origen] was the creator of the “Hexapla,” the first “Polyglot Bible.” In this “Bible” will be found what modern scholars call the “Septuagint.” However, since the only **copy available** of this “Septuagint” is written 125 years after Origen deceased, the scholars fail to show you the connection. “The Septuagint” (Vaticanus) is a manuscript copied by either Eusebius or Pamphilus, directly out of the fifth column of the Hexapla – **Origen wrote this column himself**. This is the so-called “LXX” which the young minister sees referred to in the commentaries...It is **the Vatican Manuscript containing Tobit, Judith, Bel and the Dragon**.*

*“This is the manuscript which the ASV (1901), RV (1884), and the RSV (1952) used to create a 20<sup>th</sup> century “Bible.” This is the manuscript that is used to correct the Authorized Version of the Reformation, and this is the manuscript that C. I. Scofield and other Fundamentalists refer to when they say, “The oldest manuscripts read...,” or “The best manuscripts say...,” etc...”*

Brenton<sup>41</sup> confirms Dr Ruckman’s statements with respect to the LXX. See remarks on the LXX with respect to the King James translators in **Chapter 4**. Dr Ruckman cites numerous examples of Origen’s corruptions in the New Testament, many of which were inserted into the ‘extended’ LXX, i.e. Vaticanus, are found in other Alexandrian manuscripts, e.g. Sinaiticus and persist in the modern versions. See below.

*“Origen takes the word “Carpenter” out of Mark 6:3 because he didn’t think **it should be there**.*

*“He takes one of God’s commandments clean out of Matthew 19:17-21 on the grounds that it didn’t belong there in the first place...*

*“Origen reasoned that Luke 2:14...should have said “men of good will,” instead of “**good will to men**”...*

See **Appendix, Table A1** and note that the NIV, DR, JR, JB and NWT preserve Origen’s falsehood. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“In Matthew 19:16, 17 Origen (with Eusebius and Augustine) assumed that...Jesus must have answered, “Why askest thou me **concerning the good?**”*

See **Appendix, Table A1** and note again that the NIV, DR, JR, JB and NWT preserve Origen’s falsehood. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“While subtracting from the word of God (see Gen. 3:1-6), and altering the word of God (see Gen. 3:1-6), Origen does not fail to add to the word of God (see Gen. 3:1-6). For, in spite of his “shorter readings”...Origen throws in “The Shepherd of Hermes,” and “The Epistles of Clement,” for good measure (**in the New Testament!**) to make up for his deletions.*

*“Mark 1:2, 3. Using Origen’s corrupt “Septuagint,” Eusebius, Augustine, and Jerome conjectured that the quotation which followed was from Isaiah the Prophet. Having made this conjecture, **without reading Malachi**, all of them changed the verse...The first*

*neutral critic (Origen) who approached Mark 1:2, 3 saw immediately what he was getting into, for the cross-reference in Malachi, was to the Lord God Jehovah of the Old Testament, saying: “My messenger...before ME!” If this was the right reference, then Jesus Christ was **Jehovah God, manifested in the flesh!** So the “neutral” critic took the “doctrinally suspect” passage and altered it! He made it refer to Isaiah only, instead of “**the prophets.**” The “majority of scholars” for the next 13 centuries accepted his perversion of the truth as a “neutral” text!”*

See **Appendix, Table AI** and note again that the NIV, DR, JR, JB and NWT preserve Origen’s falsehood. The reason why Origen rejected the AV1611 reading in Mark 1:2 is evident in the next example selected from Dr Ruckman’s book.

*“John 1:18. If “doctrinal passages are suspect,” then John 1:18 should be removed out of every Greek text extant, for here Origen has written... “the only begotten GOD which is in the bosom of the father...”*

*“But this is a doctrinal statement on Arianism, the heresy that Orthodox Christians were supposed to have defeated at the Council of Nicea (325 AD). Is it not very archaic to teach, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a doctrine which was thrown out by the Body of Christ more than 1600 years ago?”*

*“The AV1611 corrects this phoney Greek reading, which is obviously Origen’s own opinion about Jesus Christ, preserved in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and “C” (the Alexandrian family of manuscripts!). Tertullian (150), Athanasius (325), and Chrysostom (345) did not accept Origen’s reading here, but Westcott and Hort, A. T. Robertson, Warfield, Schaff, and Machen are still teaching...(through their books) that this reading is in the “best and oldest manuscript!”*

*“The teaching that Jesus Christ is a “god,” begotten in Eternity (or sometime before Genesis 1:1), is the official theology of the Jehovah’s Witnesses. In their “bible,” one will find that Jesus (the word) was a “god” in John 1:1 – not God but “a god.” Servetus (1511-1553) was burned at the stake for refusing to believe that the “begetting” was **eternal**; he thought the “begetting” took place when Jesus Christ was born of Mary – exactly as it appears in the context! (See Hebrews 1:6!)”*

Thus Origen was forced to reject the true reading of Mark 1:2. See also **Appendix, Table AI** and how the NIV and JB each distort the true reading in the direction of the NWT rendering, the JB by omitting “begotten,” though it retains “son” and the NIV by incorrectly inserting “God,” in partial compliance with Origen’s corrupt reading. The NASV, favoured by White, reads “only begotten God,” almost identical with the NWT’s “only begotten god.”

Having demonstrated that Origen was a bible corrupter, Dr Ruckman has also established<sup>8 p 330-1</sup> that Origen’s philosophy was essentially Gnosticism.

*““Gnosticism”...simply means “smart aleck.” A Gnostic was a “knower”...these super elect were always characterised by advanced knowledge and higher light of a “higher nature than you poor common peons, etc.,” ...The all-star “team” for Alexandria, chronologically speaking, would look like this: Plato (427-347 B.C.), Philo (20 B.C.-50 A.D.), Pantanen (145-200 A.D.), Clement (150-215 A.D.), and finally Origen (184-254 A.D.). These are the founding fathers of the Alexandrian Cult...founded and sustained by Gnostic Greek philosophers...”*

And summarising Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, Dr Ruckman<sup>33 p 377</sup> notes that, “**ORIGEN IS THE ORIGIN OF NINETY-FIVE PERCENT OF THE CORRUPTIONS IN EUROPE, ASIA, AFRICA, AND NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA.**”

See also the evidence presented earlier, especially Wilkinson’s comments under *White’s Introduction* and *Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare*.

See also Dr Ruckman’s comments on Aleph, B and Origen in *Chapter 3* where he states<sup>1 p 207</sup>, “Eusebius, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, complains about corruptions (2 Cor. 2:17) between AD 175-250. That is where Origen was working on manuscripts in Alexandria and Caesarea...”

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks in the same context in *Chapter 3*, where she states<sup>14 p 525ff</sup>, “Philip Lee, author of *Against the Protestant Gnostics* and graduate of Princeton and Harvard Divinity Schools observes: “The Alexandrian school was indeed one of the historical moments in the church’s closest proximity to Gnostic heresy...[For] Clement and Origen...gnosis [hidden wisdom], far from being a forbidden word, was a basic tent of their system...”

“The beliefs of the Alexandrian school, particularly those of Origen, are of critical interest to us because scores of scholars, tracing the history of the transmission of the text of the bible, see the hand of the Alexandrian scribes in the corruption of certain ancient copies of the text...”

“John Burgon, author of scores of scholarly books on the transmission and corruption of the original Greek manuscripts...said [*Causes of Textual Corruption*, p 95, *The Revision Revised*, p 336]: “I am of the opinion that such depravations of the text [as found in Aleph and B] were in the first instance intentional. Origen may be regarded as the prime offender...the author of all the mischief...The archetype of Codices B and Aleph...is discovered to have experienced adulteration largely from the same pestilential source which must have corrupted the copies with which Clement (and his pupil Origen after him) were most familiar.””

See also the comments by Cloud in the same context<sup>6 Part 3</sup>.

““THOSE WHO ARE BEST ACQUAINTED WITH THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN OPINION KNOW BEST, THAT ORIGEN WAS THE GREAT CORRUPTER, AND THE SOURCE, OR AT LEAST EARLIEST CHANNEL, OF NEARLY ALL THE SPECULATIVE ERRORS WHICH PLAGUED THE CHURCH IN AFTER AGES” (Dabney, I, p. 383).”

In his response to Stewart Custer of Bob Jones University, Dr Ruckman<sup>57 p 27-8</sup> also cited Dr Hills’s research into “(a) *Heretical Readings in Codex Aleph*,” which reads in part.

“Some of the scribes who copied some of the ancient manuscripts were heretics, probably Gnostics, who altered the texts that they were copying rather freely in order to tone down the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures concerning Christ’s deity...Burgon (1896) long ago traced these corruptions [in John 1:18] to...Valentinus, a famous Gnostic teacher.”

See comments earlier. Note also Dr Moorman’s remarks<sup>9 p 100</sup> on the NASV reading, “only begotten God” as follows. “This is the classic Gnostic perversion with its doctrine of “intermediary gods.” It is the trademark of corruption in the early Egyptian manuscripts which unfortunately spread to some others.”

How did White miss all of this? He cites<sup>3 p 109</sup> Dr Ruckman’s *Handbook*, and discusses Dr Ruckman’s response to Stewart Custer in *this very chapter*. Yet White insists that,

*“Dr Ruckman provides no evidence that “Gnostics” had anything to do with the production of manuscripts associated with Alexandria.”*

The truth is, White evaded the evidence.

Paul warns of those who **“with their tongues they have used deceit”** Romans 3:13b.

James White differs only in that he has substituted his computer for his tongue.

He accuses Dr Ruckman of building a *“house-of-misrepresentation”* in his objections to Dr Ruckman’s point 7, White’s emphasis.

*“There are...many “streams” of Bibles, in the sense that we can even identify “streams” within the Byzantine text-type...The KJV’s text is but one example of one “stream” within a larger river. And again it is untrue that there is no final, absolute, authority for determining truth and error. Jesus said, “I am the way, the truth and the life. No man comes to the Father but by me.” It doesn’t matter what translation you use, that truth remains true all the same...the idea that you **can’t know** that it is absolutely true unless you buy into KJV Onlyism should cause any Christian person a **great deal** of concern.”*

If White can *“identify “streams” within the Byzantine text-type,”* why doesn’t he specify them, given that he has evidently consulted David Otis Fuller’s book, *Which Bible?* that contains Wilkinson’s summary of the evidence? See remarks under **White’s Introduction**.

*“Fundamentally, there are only two streams of bibles. The vast volume of literature on this subject [shows] that down through the centuries there were only two streams of manuscripts.*

*“This first stream appears with very little change, in the Protestant Bibles of many languages, and in English, in that Bible known as the King James Version, the one which has been in use for three hundred years in the English-speaking world. These manuscripts have in agreement with them, by far the vast majority of copies of the original text. So vast is this majority that even the enemies of the Received Text admit that nineteenth-twentieths of all Greek manuscripts are of this class...”*

See also Dr Vance’s summary under **The Revision Conspiracy**. The point that White evades is that, as Wilkinson states, the bibles of these *““streams” within the Byzantine text-type”* essentially *“agree with the Text of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible,”* vindicating Wilkinson’s conclusion above.

Dr Mrs Riplinger devotes an entire chapter of her latest work<sup>39 p 1047ff</sup> to demonstrate *“the perfect agreement of the English King James Bible with all pure Bibles from other languages,”* by means of *“the twelve language polyglot Bible printed at Nuremberg, Germany in AD 1599, [which] contains the Gospels in Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English, German, Danish, Bohemian, and Polish.”*

She states *“It is perhaps the most important polyglot Bible in print because it was printed twelve years **before the KJV** and five years before the KJV’s translation work began.”*

She compares the readings of the AV1611 and the pre-AV1611 pure bibles in over 50 verses and shows by means of inclusion of the modern alternatives that *“the NKJV, NIV, NASB...yoked their unsuspecting readers with the Jehovah’s Witness sect and the Roman Catholic system.”*

The verses listed include Matthew 5:44, 6:13b, 33, 7:14, 28, 8:19, 29, 11:23, 15:8, 9, 17:21, 19:16, 17, 22:32, 24:45, 25:21, Mark 2:15, 9:29, 42, 10:21, 24, 52, 12:32, 13:33,

Luke 2:40, 4:4, 8, 5:20, 6:40, 9:35, 11:2, 4, 54, 12:31, 22:64, 68, 23:42, 24:36, 51, 52, John 1:14, 18, 3:13, 4:42, 6:47, 69, 7:39, 9:3, 4, 35, 10:29, 32, 14:14, 16:16.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states that these verses address major doctrines, including the word of God, the nature of God, the Deity of Christ, His death resurrection and ascension, salvation by grace through faith and the Christian life.

The close association between these “*streams*” of pure bibles goes even deeper.

Because Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 456ff</sup> also shows, with numerous examples, how even the AV1611 word endings, altered by modern translations, match those of bibles in other languages, materially assisting those on the mission field, her emphases.

*“Jesus Christ, “the Word” and even “the ending” letter (Rev. 1:8) speaks and spells words in similar ways to the Greek, English, German, French, Italian, and Hebrew (Yiddish). The KJV is the only English Bible that speaks and spells like all of these language groups. Wise missionaries love the KJV...*

*“The amazing thing about the KJV’s ‘est’ and ‘eth’ endings is that they **match** the verb endings in most of the languages of the world. These **too** have an ‘s’ in the second person and a ‘t’ in the third person verb endings! The KJV’s ‘becamest’ is wurdest’ in **Modern German**...*

*“**New Versions do not** match the world’s languages. The KJV is international English and is God’s bridge to reach a world now clamouring to learn English.”*

*“Those who speak Greek, German, Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Yiddish and many other languages know that an ‘s’ in the ending means **second person** singular. The use of a ‘t’ in the ending also signals the **third person** to many.”*

Contrary to White’s insinuation that the AV1611 Text is but a ripple “*within a larger river,*” the AV1611 Text, therefore, is the “*larger river.*”

White’s “*many “streams” of Bibles*” are equivalent to the “*multiple translations of the Bible*” that he urges readers to acquire<sup>3 p 7</sup>. See remarks at the end of **Chapter 1**. Dr Mrs Riplinger has this rebuke<sup>96 p 92-3</sup> for White’s lack of missionary vision – a passage that he will have read but for obvious reasons, failed to comment on.

*“It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.”*

Observe that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks apply equally to White’s notion<sup>3 p 159</sup> that deletion of an expression in part of, for example, the NIV New Testament is fine, as long as, White’s emphases “*that same material is found elsewhere in the NIV New Testament.*” White has again failed to consider the position of a native Christian on the mission field who may have only limited access to the scriptures. See remarks in **Chapter 4**.

White’s attempt to show that “*it is untrue that there is no final, absolute, authority for determining truth and error*” by quoting the Lord Jesus Christ in John 14:6 is further evasion on his part. Dr Ruckman’s point 7 is addressing *books*, not truth in the abstract, as White does. The notion that “*It doesn’t matter what translation you use, that truth re-*

*mains true all the same,*” avails the truth-seeker nothing, unless that truth can be accessed by means of *written* words that are finally authoritative.

White has not stipulated how these written words can be unequivocally accessed between two covers.

White accuses Dr Ruckman of constructing an “*argument from pragmatism*” with respect to his point 8. On the basis of Calvin’s comments, White maintains that “*We have already shown that the claim that the TR was the “text of the Reformation” is less than honest. It was the basic text used, but that by default, not particular choice.*”

See comments in **Chapter 4** and note again Cloud’s citation of Nolan<sup>6 Part 3</sup>.

*“NOLAN SHOWS THAT THE REFORMATION EDITORS DID NOT FOLLOW THE RECEIVED TEXT BECAUSE THEY LACKED SUFFICIENT TEXTUAL EVIDENCE, BUT BECAUSE THEY CONSCIOUSLY CHOSE TO REJECT THE CRITICAL READINGS. (Contrast this with White’s statement on page 69 that the Reformation editors “used this text by default, not by choice.”)”*

Note again Hills’s evaluation<sup>65 p 208</sup> of Calvin’s humanistic comments and those of other reformers.

*“Just as with Erasmus and Calvin, so also with Beza there was evidently a conflict going on within his mind between his humanistic tendency to treat the New Testament like any other book and the common faith in the current New Testament text. But...God used this common faith providentially to restrain Beza’s humanism and lead him to publish far and wide the true New Testament text.”*

And note again Dr Mrs Riplinger’s response<sup>39 p 932ff</sup> to White’s misleading remarks about “*the “text of the Reformation.”*”

*“White...is trying to give his readers the false impression that these men ‘created’ this text, rather than merely PRINTING the Greek text that was received everywhere. Erasmus’ Greek New Testament text was a mirror of the handwritten Greek texts which were used before the advent of the printing press. Erasmus was merely the first to PRINT IT, PUBLISH IT AND CIRCULATE IT, in the new printed format...”*

White then contradicts himself in the rest of his comments, his emphasis, on Dr Ruckman’s point 8.

*“Luther used the **Vulgate** until he received Erasmus’ text, and God used the Latin just as He used the Greek to lead the great Reformer away from the abuses of medieval Catholicism...Most of the others cited [in Dr Ruckman’s point 8] were not particularly concerned about textual issues, and they used what was popularly available to the people.”*

So Luther *did* exercise a choice about the text he used, even though in the previous sentence, White says he *didn’t*. Hills states<sup>110 p 82</sup> that “*it was through the study of the Vulgate...that Martin Luther gained his knowledge of those Gospel truths by which he ushered in the Protestant Reformation*” but it is noteworthy that Erasmus published his Greek New Testament in 1516<sup>8 p 18</sup>, the year before Martin Luther nailed\* his 95 Theses to the cathedral door at Wittenberg<sup>116 p 787</sup>.

God clearly wanted to have Erasmus’s Greek New Testament in print before energising Luther to carry forward the Reformation.

\*The date, October 31<sup>st</sup>, 1517, has since been known as Reformation Day<sup>117</sup>.

And Hills also states<sup>110 p 13</sup> that “*It was this Traditional (Masoretic) text which...was used by Luther in translating the Old Testament into German. Other faithful Protestant translations followed including...the King James Version. Thus it was that the Hebrew Old Testament text, divinely inspired and providentially preserved, was restored to the Church and the promise of Christ was fulfilled [e.g. Matthew 24:35<sup>110 p 30</sup>].*”

Dr Ruckman adds<sup>33 p 108</sup>, his emphases.

“*Luther’s “legions” are well known. Having obtained the God-honored Greek text from Erasmus, Luther produced a “hoch Deutsch” translation that nearly created the German language. Martin’s **German Bible** is the German **King James Bible**. It is the equivalent of the “King’s English,” and so all affirm...Luther translated the New Testament into German in 1521-1522 with the Old Testament being translated in 1534.*”

And as Wilkinson affirms<sup>12 p 221</sup>, “*The Reformation did not make great progress until after the Received Text had been restored to the world. The Reformers were not satisfied with the Latin Vulgate.*” See remarks under ***The God-Honoured Text of the Reformation and 1611***.

Wilkinson observes<sup>12 p 198, 200, 212</sup> with respect to Luther’s Bible, “*The ancient records of the first believers in Christ in those parts [“Syria, northern Italy, southern France and Great Britain”], disclose a Christianity which is not Roman but apostolic. These lands were first penetrated by missionaries, not from Rome, but from Palestine and Asia Minor. And the Greek New Testament, the Received Text they brought with them, or its translation, was of the type from which the Protestant Bibles, as the King James in English, and the Lutheran in German, were translated. We shall presently see that it differed greatly from the Eusebio-Origen Greek New Testament.*”

“*The Eusebio-Origen Greek New Testament*” is the basis for the New Testament of the Vulgate of Jerome, because, as noted under ***The God-Honoured Text of the Reformation and 1611***, according to Wilkinson<sup>12 p 206, 209</sup>, “*the great scholar Helvidius, who from the circumstances of the case was probably a Vaudois [Waldensian], accused him of using corrupted Greek manuscripts...It is recognized that the Itala [the Latin Bible, the Italic...translated from the Greek not later than 157 AD] was translated from the Received Text (Syrian, Hort calls it) ; that the Vulgate is the Itala with the readings of the Received Text removed.*”

Wilkinson affirms, with a quote “*from the Forum of June, 1887:*

“*The old Italic version into the rude Low Latin of the second century held its own as long as Latin continued to be the language of the people. The critical version of Jerome never displaced it, and only replaced it when the Latin ceased to be a living language, and became the language of the learned. The Gothic version of Ulfilas, in the same way, held its own until the tongue in which it was written ceased to exist. Luther’s Bible was the first genuine beginning of modern German literature. In Germany, as in England, many critical translations have been made, but they have fallen stillborn from the press”*”

And Wilkinson notes that Luther may have had access to the Old Latin Bible, so that the great Reformer may have relied on this source, instead of, or at least in addition to, the text of the Vulgate to usher in the Protestant Reformation.

“*From Comba we also learn that the Tepl manuscript has an origin different from the version adopted by the Church of Rome; that it seems to agree rather with the Latin versions anterior to Jerome, the author of the Vulgate; and that Luther followed it in his translation, which probably is the reason why the Catholic Church reproved Luther for*

*following the Waldenses...We have, therefore, an indication of how much the Reformation under Luther as well as Luther's Bible owed to the Waldenses."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger explains<sup>39 p 977</sup> that, "*The Codex Teplensis (Tepl Bible) of 1389 is thought to be of the Waldensian text-type (KJV) and not a Latin text-type. This is evident because it does not invert 1 John 5:7, as the corrupt Latin does. Even Metzger admits it is non-Vulgate in Acts and the epistles.*"

So whatever insights Luther gained from the Vulgate, in the providence of God, he shifted away from it as soon as possible when translating the scriptures into German, a fact that White chooses to ignore.

Dr Ruckman's point 8 does not address whether or not the individuals cited were "*particularly concerned about textual issues.*" It addresses what God did through the lives and ministries of the men who were loyal to the Received Text and the bibles derived therefrom.

And if the Received Text was, in fact, "*what was popularly available to the people,*" why didn't the Lord make available a superior text, if one was to be had? See comments to this effect in **Chapter 4**.

White has a note related to Dr Ruckman's point 8 that states "*in his anti-Calvinistic book entitled Hyper-Calvinism...we read with reference to John Calvin, "This led to a very embarrassing question asked of him by Jacob Arminius." John Calvin died May 27, 1564; Arminius was born in 1560. How a three – or four- year-old child could be asking "embarrassing questions" is difficult to figure out. Dr Ruckman's materials are marked by this kind of 'looseness' when presenting facts.*"

And James White's book is marked by a distinct "*kind of 'looseness'*" when he is confronted with facts.

It is quite unnecessary for James White even to raise the subject of Hyper-Calvinism in his discussion of Dr Ruckman's points but since he does, it is highly discourteous simply to evade it by resorting to ridicule.

His snide comment immediately begs additional questions.

- What was the "*embarrassing question*"?
- How did Calvinists answer it?
- How does the Calvinistic answer compare with the scripture?
- Why is White so unobservant that he cannot appreciate that Dr Ruckman is using a simple form of irony, or satire, much as Erasmus did<sup>39 p 1010ff</sup> when challenging Pope Julius by means of a hypothetical dialogue between the pontiff and the apostle Peter?

The first three of the above questions can be easily answered – by reviewing what Dr Ruckman *actually* wrote, his emphases.

From *Hyper-Calvinism*, 1984, p 11, "*This led to a very embarrassing question asked of him by Jacob Arminius. The question was, "Since only God knows who the elect are, what are you going to do about all the babies that die? Are they all **elect babies**? And the very embarrassing answer given by Calvin and his followers was, "Well, we can hope for the best"...*

*"Calvin was not a very conscientious student of scripture. If he had been he would have noticed in the passages in Romans 5:13 and Romans 4:15 that **any child**, before he is old*



*enough to know good and evil (Deut. 1:39), is “elect” as far as salvation is concerned and his sins are not charged to him. But, as we have said before, Calvin was a very shallow student of the word of God.”*

So is his follower, James White.

White’s last comment on Dr Ruckman’s point 8 is that *“Spurgeon is often misrepresented by KJV Only advocates, though Dr Ruckman admits he was willing to vary from the KJV at times.”*

As usual, it is White who is engaging in misrepresentation. Dr Ruckman has shown<sup>8 p 283</sup> that Spurgeon’s departures from the AV1611 occurred towards the end of his ministry and resulted in his premature departure to Glory.

God blessed Spurgeon when he was faithful to the AV1611 but took him home when he defected from it. See below.

*“William Grady describes God’s blessing on Spurgeon’s early ministry. “After being saved for only two years, a seventeen-year-old Spurgeon was called to pastor the Water-beach Church of London in 1852. Using a King James Bible, the teenage pastor converted nearly his entire community.” There follows a detailed description from Spurgeon’s own autobiography...*

*“Dr Ruckman states: “God is no respecter of persons. Whenever, and wherever, Spurgeon messed with that Book (the AV), God messed with his mind...Spurgeon began to correct the Protestant reformation text, in the universal language, with the DEAD language of the Alexandrian text (RV) used for the Jesuit Rheims Bible of 1582. God trapped him and stumbled him (Ezek. 14:1-6). God is no respecter of persons.*

*““The first Sabbath after his return from the sunny South - February 8, 1891 - the pastor (Spurgeon) preached at the Tabernacle from Isaiah 62:6, 7, using both the Authorised and Revised Versions...He had been especially struck with the revisers rendering of the text.” The Lord took Charles H. Spurgeon home the year after he preached that message (C. H. Spurgeon Autobiography, Vol. 2, Banner of Truth Trust, p. 497).”*

*“Spurgeon was only 58 years old when he died. In spite of our critic’s opinion, see above, the Lord had cut short the ministry of “the Prince of preachers.” Dr. Ruckman concludes:*

*““Today, his “tabernacle” is a ghostly monument.””*

White has a note<sup>3 p 126</sup> concerning Spurgeon that refers the reader to *“Doug Kutilek’s An Answer to David Otis Fuller’s Deceptive Treatment of Spurgeon Regarding the King James Version.”*

Readers may access the article on Kutilek’s site<sup>84</sup> and compare it with extract above.

The following may also be of interest with respect to Spurgeon<sup>8 p 282</sup>. Emphases are this author’s.

*“Our critic then commends Spurgeon for adding the words “And we are” to 1 John 3:1, from the RV and “the Vulgate and the Alexandrian family of MSS.” See Section 10.3. Spurgeon evidently believed that these words “are clearly the words of inspiration.” “This fragment” said Spurgeon “has been dropped by our older translators and it is too precious to be lost.”*

*“The Jesuits who translated the Douay Rheims thought so too. Their version reads “that we should be called, and should be the sons of God.” See Section 11.4. Tyndale, whom*

they burnt at the stake, did NOT. His New Testament reads as the AV1611 “that we should be called the sons of God.”

“Spurgeon then evidently preached **“a marvellous sermon on the assured position of the child of God from the Revised Version.”**”

Kutilek states that Spurgeon preached this sermon in 1886. He died in 1892 – see above. The Lord gave Spurgeon **“space to repent”** Revelation 2:21 and it appears that he used it up.

Though naturally, Kutilek did not quote Spurgeon as follows<sup>8 p1</sup>.

*“The Bible is God’s word, and when I see it, I seem to hear a voice saying, ‘I am the Book of God, man, read me; I am God’s writing: open my leaves, for I was penned by God’...I plead with you, I beg of you, respect your Bibles, and search them out. Go home and read your Bibles...O Book of books! And wast thou written by my God? Then I will bow before thee, thou Book of vast authority! For He has written this Book Himself...let us love it, let us count it more precious than fine gold!”*

Dr Ruckman has printed several articles<sup>118</sup>, which reveal that Spurgeon believed the AV1611 to be the pure word of God for most of his ministry, though he sometimes defected from this stance.

For example, **“THIS IS GOD’S BOOK!”** versus *“In this place the RV has a better reading.”*

Dr Ruckman explains the apparent inconsistency succinctly as follows (in the same issue of the *Bulletin* that notifies the reader of Kutilek’s web site), his emphasis. *“Every born-again Christian...has TWO NATURES. These two natures **contradict** each other (Rom. 7:14-25).”*

It is easy to see which nature Spurgeon occasionally capitulated to with respect to **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 and to which nature White and Kutilek habitually capitulate.

White’s complaint against Dr Ruckman’s point 9 contains the piteous remonstrance *“this is directed towards servants of Christ who are working to proclaim His truth in churches and missionary works all over the land and even the world.”*

Sheer hypocrisy. White has not stipulated *anywhere* in his book where **“His truth”** exists, except, possibly, in *“multiple translations.”* See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments above about *“rich Americans”* versus those around the world with *“no King James Bible type bibles at all.”*

For the comments of Dr Ruckman and other writers on James White’s seven ‘errors’ in the AV1611, as listed in the **Introduction**, see **Chapter 4** with respect to Luke 2:22, Jeremiah 34:16, Revelation 16:5 and 1 John 5:7.

James White has these comments on Acts 5:30 and Hebrews 10:23<sup>3 p 225-6</sup>, his emphasis. Note that the readings that he recommends also match those of the DR, JB, JB, NWT. See **Appendix 1, Table A1**. Note also that he has published his own responses to Dr Ruckman’s evaluation of James White’s seven ‘errors’ in the AV1611 on his site, though only with respect to Luke 2:22 and Acts 5:30.

See [aomin.org/ResponseToRuckman.html](http://aomin.org/ResponseToRuckman.html). The reader can judge whether or not White has made an honest and accurate response to Dr Ruckman’s evaluation. In this writer’s view, White has not added anything of substance to the material in his book on these

verses. Detailed comment on his response is beyond the scope of this work but inspection of White's response shows that he has not yet identified any finally-authoritative 'bible' as the pure word of God between two covers, so his later remarks are no further advanced than his recommendation<sup>3 p 7</sup> that Christians "*purchase and use multiple translations of the bible.*" Once again, no doubt James White would be happy to act as the 'final authority' for any of the Lord's people bemused over different renderings found in these "*multiple translations.*"

But as Solomon says, "***Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him***" Proverbs 26:12.

White's comments on Acts 5:30 and Hebrews 10:23 follow.

*"The NKJV corrects the problem seen in the KJV rendering [of Acts 5:30]. Peter did not say that the Jews had slain Jesus and then hung him on a tree. Instead, they put the Lord to death by hanging Him on the tree. It is difficult to see exactly where the KJV derived its translation, as there is no "and" in the text to separate "slew" and "hanged on a tree."*

*"The KJV translation of Hebrews 10:23 leaves most people wondering as well. The KJV has the phrase "the profession of our faith." Literally, the first term should be translated "confession," but it is the KJV's very unusual translation of the Greek term "hope" as "faith" that is difficult to understand. The Greek term appears thirteen times in the TR, and each time it is translated "hope" with this one exception."*

Dr Ruckman writes<sup>1 p 283, 2</sup> as follows on Acts 5:30, Hebrews 10:23 Acts 19:37, his emphases.

*"Acts 5:30 "is a simple mistranslation"<sup>3 p 81, 225-6, 238</sup>. " The Jackleg's reasoning is that the AV translators thought that Jesus Christ was slain before He was crucified. The silly child surmised this from "**whom YE slew and hanged on a tree**" (Acts 5:30)...*

*"White's famous "How can this be?"<sup>3 p 131</sup>...comes out like this "IT IS DIFFICULT TO SEE" (i.e. **difficult for HIM**) exactly where the KJV derived its translation, as there is no "**and**" in the text to separate "**slew**" and "**hanged on a tree**"...*

*"Blazing hypocrisy in action." "There is no '**and**' in the text"...There is no "**came**" in any Greek manuscript in 1 Thessalonians 2:5 (NASV). There is no article ("**the**") in any Greek manuscript "extant" for 1 Corinthians 2:16 (NIV). There is no "**was**" in any Greek manuscript extant for the third clause of 1 Timothy 3:16 (NASV). There is no "**Who had been**" in any Greek manuscript on Matthew 1:6 (NASV). So? There is no "**God**" in any Greek manuscript extant in Acts 7:59 (NKJV). So? So Mr White simply pretended there was a problem...where there **wasn't** any problem. He found no fault with the same "problem" in the versions he was trying to sell...*

*"Here is 2 Samuel 20:12; 1 Samuel 17:51; and 2 Samuel 3:27, 30. Peter, James, and John (Acts 5:30)...knew that David "**slew**" Goliath with a sling and **later** "**slew**" him with a sword...how did [White] fail to see that Abishai was guilty of "slaying" Abner, when Abishai wasn't even in **the vicinity** when **Joab** slew Abner?... "How did Amasa **DIE**, and then **LATER** "**wallowed in blood in the midst of the highway**?"..."*

*"That is the Hebrew way of stating killing and murder. Often a man is killed and dead, and then a statement is made that he was slain, **later**. He is "slain **before** he is slain"..."*

*“Every Jew in Peter’s audience understood the order of the words in the **King James text**. Luke, who was the author of Acts, chapter 5, said in his Gospel, Luke 24:20: **“The chief priests and rulers...HAVE CRUCIFIED HIM.”**”*

*“They did nothing of the kind.*

*“No ruler, or chief priest, put **one** hand to **one** nail, or **one** whip, or **one** crown of thorns, or **one** crucifix during the entire operation...”*

*“No Jew “SLEW” Christ and no Jew “CRUCIFIED” Christ.*

*“It was Roman soldiers who mocked Him, whipped Him, and nailed Him...[but] no Roman soldier could have “SLAIN” Christ if he had stayed up twenty centuries... White forgot that Jesus Christ laid down His life (John 10:15) because NO MAN (Roman or Jew) could “slay” Him (John 10:18)...”*

*“The truth is that [the Jews] were “accessories before the fact.” So they were **charged** with Christ’s murder. That was exactly the case with **Abishai** in 2 Samuel. The Jews put Jesus Christ into a situation where **someone else** could do the “slaying” (John 19:11). This act (John 19:11) was equivalent to the **Jewish leaders** killing (1 Thess. 2:15), crucifying (Luke 24:20), and **slaying** (Acts 5:30) Him: although **they** never touched Him after He picked up His cross. Peter is charging them on **pre-killing grounds**. To all practical purposes, **they** slew Him the moment they passed the death sentence on Him (Mark 14:64), and they did do **that**.*

*“Abishai slew Abner because Abishai was in “cahoots” with his brother. He, himself, never touched Abner. David killed Uriah with the sword of the children of Ammon [2 Samuel 12:9]. Who didn’t know THAT but Jimmy White?”*

*“Total ignorance of Jewish idioms, total ignorance of “accessories before the fact,” total ignorance of shared guilt, total ignorance of Scriptural example, and Scriptural revelation, total ignorance of WHO actually was involved in the crucifixion, plus total ignorance of why the blame was placed on the Jews.”*

Dr Ruckman summarises this material in his commentary on Acts<sup>88 p 213</sup>, published in 1974. Why did White ignore it?

See this summary<sup>8 p 165-6</sup> of Dr Ruckman’s comments, with respect to the same objections to Acts 5:30, raised by another bible critic.

*“Our critic’s next “error” is in Acts 5:30, where the AV1611 reading “**whom ye slew and hanged on a tree**” should be changed to “whom you had killed by hanging him on a tree” in the NIV. The JB, NWT, Ne and the renderings of all the other Greek texts follow suit, with minor variation. However, the NIV alone has the additional words “from the dead” which do not appear in any of the Greek editions.*

*“Of this alteration, Dr. Ruckman states, *ibid* p 213: “The idea behind the juggling (of verse 30) is that the “first aorist middle indicative” and the “first aorist active participle” are supposed to indicate the slaying took place AFTER the hanging. But, of course, all of this grammatical twaddling does nothing for the text; “**YE**” in the text is aimed at men who did not even touch a nail, spear, rope, mallet, cross, or hammer. They did not “SLAY” Christ BEFORE or AFTER. He was hung on a tree, and Peter’s remark is going behind the bare act to the INTENTION of the elders of Israel when they delivered Jesus over to Pilate. First Aorists and Middle participles are about as relevant to proper exposition of the text as first basemen and middle line-backers.” John 11:53 states “**they took***

*counsel together for to put him to death” and 1 John 3:15 states “Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.””*

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 183</sup> states with respect to Acts 5:30 that, his emphases, “Some scholars object to the phrase, “whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.” They argue that the correct rendering is “whom ye killed by hanging on a tree” and that the conjunction and in the KJV misleadingly suggests that the Jews first killed Christ and then hanged his body on the tree [Dr Holland cites White<sup>3 p 225-6</sup> in a footnote]. This suggestion is faulty in that it misconstrues the text of the Authorized Version, making the text say “whom ye slew and **THEN** hanged on a tree.”

“In English, the word and does not usually mean a period of time, as is suggested with the addition of the word then. The text is not saying that the Jews murdered Christ **and then** placed him on the cross. The word and is a conjunction which simply links two thoughts together. As such, it is used as the word further. We understand the text to mean that the Jews were responsible for killing their Messiah. Further, they were responsible for having him placed on the cross. This is a proper use of English. When one assumes that the text is stating that the Jews murdered the Lord **and then** crucified him, they are reading their own thoughts into the text. The translation “whom ye slew and hanged on a tree” is just as correct as the translation “whom you killed by hanging on the tree.””

Dr Ruckman proceeds with his answer to White’s objection to Hebrews 10:23 as found in the AV1611.

“The word “faith” here should have been “hope” (Greek eipidos, from eipis)...

“White’s typical comments are that the AV reading “is difficult to understand” and “leaves most people wondering as well”...I never met any Christian who was “left wondering” at the “faith” of Hebrews 10:23, especially since the immediate context (vs. 22) and the nearest context are dealing with FAITH (Heb. 11:1-30, 10:22, and 10:38)...

“Hebrews 10:23 is a simple case where a word that normally has been translated one way is now translated another way. Instances in the corrupt Bibles that White recommends are so numerous, no one could list them on five pages. For example, in the NIV, the Greek for “fornication” (Greek pornei) is translated as “marital unfaithfulness” in Matthew 5:32, “sexual immorality” in Matthew 19:9, “illegitimate children” in John 8:41, “evil” in Romans 1:29, and “sexual sin” in 2 Corinthians 12:21.

“This was the NIV: six different ways to translate one word, and White says TWO different ways of translating “eipidos” is an ERROR. The NIV, that White recommends to high heaven, says that porneias is “sexual immorality” twelve times and then says it’s “adultery” in Revelation 2:22...

“The word “hope” in the New Testament, for the child of God, is a word used many times for the Rapture of the Body of Christ, where the Christian will receive a new body... Titus 2:13, 1 John 3:1-3. Our HOPE is a **person**...The passage in Hebrews 10:16-25 is NOT Christ coming for any Christian on this earth. The “day” spoken of in 10:25 is a day where **Israel** is judged (vs. 30), and the Lord’s coming is in **judgement** (vs. 37) as found in Malachi 4:1-4. Hebrews is aimed at **Hebrews**. (White could never figure that one out, either)...

“Nobody ever held fast to a “profession of hope.” Timothy’s “good profession” (1 Tim. 6:12) before “many witnesses” was his profession of FAITH in Jesus Christ. Notice the identical profession in Hebrews 4:14. Our FAITH in Someone is our profession which

we must “hold fast.” You don’t go round declaring “I hope I’m saved, I hope I’m saved, I hope I’m saved.” **That** profession is worthless. The faith in Christ that the Hebrew is exhorted to “hold fast” in Hebrews 10:23 (“our faith”) is defined in verses 16-22: it is immediate access to Jesus Christ in the third heaven because of His blood atonement...

“Perhaps Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, p 531-2, can help White out... “The definition of PISTIS (Faith, more than ninety times in the New Testament) as...in Hebrews 11:1 is quite in keeping with the Old Testament inter-relating of PISTUEIN (to **believe**) and ELPIZEIN...as well as ELPIS (“hope”)... With PISTIS (faith), ELPIS (hope), this constitutes Christian experience...what is denoted by ELPIS (hope) can be included in PISTIS (faith).”

“So the AV had the correct word since it included BOTH words, and White’s doll babies (NIV and NASV) were just sorry displays of Beginner’s Greek Grammar...Correct White’s Greek (eipidos) with the English (“faith”) in Hebrews 10:23.”

Note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks on Gerhard Kittel above. Yet even Kittel acknowledges the AV1611 reading as accurate.

Concerning White’s opinion that “Literally, the first term should be translated “confession,” the word “**confession**” is used in the scriptures with respect to confession of sin; Joshua 7:19, 2 Chronicles 30:22, Ezra 10:11, Daniel 9:4 and as “**confess**” in 1 John 1:9 and elsewhere in both Testaments, e.g. Leviticus 5:5, Nehemiah 1:6, Matthew 3:6, Acts 19:18, as “**confessing**” and “**confessed**” respectively. Where it is used in Romans 10:10, and as “**confess**” in verse 9, the context includes the saved sinner acknowledging that the Lord Jesus Christ died for his sins. The word “**confess**” is used several times in the New Testament to denote that the Lord Jesus Christ is the true Messiah, Matthew 10:32, Luke 12:8, John 9:22, 12:42 and by implication He Who would “**save his people from their sins,**” in contrast to “**the law of the fathers,**” Acts 22:3, thus incurring ‘excommunication,’ or expulsion from the synagogue.

The Lord Jesus Christ “**before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession**” 1 Timothy 6:13, when Pilate asked Him a specific question, “**Art thou the King of the Jews...Art thou a king then?**” John 18:33-37. Like John the Baptist, who was also asked specific questions, Jesus “**confessed, and denied not: but confessed**” John 1:20.

“**Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice.**”

Pilate was convinced. See John 18:39b.

“**Will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?**”

The term “**confession,**” therefore, has particular connotations that differentiate it from the term “**profession,**” even if the distinction may be fine.

For example, Timothy “**professed a good profession before many witnesses**” 1 Timothy 6:13b. His profession was like the Lord’s confession, verse 13 but instead of an answer to a specific question, such as that posed by Pilate, Timothy’s “**profession**” would have been that of what Paul described as “**the unfeigned faith that is in thee**” 2 Timothy 1:5a. Timothy’s profession was therefore like that of Hebrews 10:23. The AV1611 is correct in both passages and White is wrong.

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 190-1</sup>, updated from Dr Holland’s site has these informative comments on Hebrews 10:23.

““Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;)” (Hebrews 10:23).

“The common word for “faith” is the Greek word “pistis.” However, the word used here is “elpidos” which is translated as “hope.”

““The KJV translation of Hebrews 10:23 leaves most people wondering as well. The KJV has the phrase ‘the profession of our faith.’ Literally the first term should be translated ‘confession,’ but it is the KJV’s very unusual translation of the Greek term ‘hope’ as ‘faith’ that is difficult to understand. The Greek term appears thirteen times in the TR, and each time it is translated ‘hope’ with this one exception.” (The King James Only Controversy, p. 226).

“This does not mean that it is a mistranslation. In fact, the KJV translators stated that they were not bound by strict word counts and that sometimes the context demands that the same Greek word be translated differently. The English words “faith” and “hope” carry the idea of trust, assurance that what has been told will occur. The Thesaurus for my Microsoft Works has for the word “hope,” “confidence: faith, reliance, trust, belief, assurance.” Further, there is within Scripture a clear connection between faith and hope. “Faith is the substance of things hoped for” (Hebrews 11:1). Notice the clear Biblical connection of faith with hope. The Scripture state, “By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.” (Romans 5:2). And in reference to Abraham, the word of God says,

““Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sara’s womb” (Romans 4:18-19).

“We are saved by hope (Romans 8:24) and yet we are saved by grace through faith (Ephesians 2:8). We are told to place our faith and hope in God (1 Peter 1:21). The context of Hebrews chapter ten informs us that we are to have full assurance of faith (vs.22) and the One we are trusting is “faithful” (vs. 23). The context of the Greek word “elpis” in this verse can be expressed by the English words faith, hope, or trust. The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, even though it cites the American Standard Version, says of this verse:

““Confession of our hope (ASV). And unwavering confession of faith in the living Christ. God undergirds our hope by his own promises, for he is faithful who promised. This then speaks of further affirmation based upon faith in the faithfulness of God” (Nashville: The Southwestern Company, 1962, p. 1420).

“Kittel notes the comparison of faith and hope when defining the Greek word “elpis” (hope). He even notes that in the Greek LXX there is an “interrelating” of the two Greek words for faith and hope.

““If hope is fixed on God, it embraces at once the three elements of expectation of the future, trust, and the patience of waiting. Any one of these aspects may be emphasized. The definition of pistis as elpizomenon upostasis in H[e]b[rews] 11:1 is quite in keeping with the OT interrelating of pisteuein and elpizein and the usage of the LXX, which has upostasis as well as elpis” (Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. II. p. 531).

“Faith, trust, and hope are used interchangeably. A related word of elpis (hope) is elpizo. It is translated as “hope” in places such as Luke 6:34 and Romans 8:25. How-

ever, it is mostly translated as “trust” in places such as Matthew 12:21 and Romans 15:24. A related word of *pistis* (faith) is *pistuo*. It is translated as “believe” in places such as Matthew 8:13 and John 3:16. However, it is also translated as “trust” in 1 Timothy 1:11 (as is another form of it in 1 Thessalonians 2:4 which is translated as “trust”).

*“The context of Hebrews chapters ten and eleven, demands that this type of trust be translated as “faith” instead of its normal translation of “hope.” Also, since we are told to “hold fast the profession” we must compare the Scriptures to know that our profession deals with “faith” (1 Timothy 6:12).”*

White has clearly not examined Hebrews 10:23 in anything like the depth that Dr Holland has.

Dr Ruckman writes with respect to Acts 19:37, his emphases, *“Here, the Greek word for “temples,” found in all “text-types” and “families,” has been “mistranslated” by the king’s men (1611) as “churches,” instead of “temples.” This is an error, according to Jimbo. However! Such translation is **not** an error in the NIV, that Jimbo recommends. Scores of times, in the NIV, this type of dynamic equivalence is used...*

*“The passages are Matthew 6:22, John 1:16, 6:27, 14:30, Acts 26:20, Romans 1:3, 2:17, 6:4, 8:10, 1 Corinthians 2:4, 5:5, 7:4, 17, 11:19, 12:6, Galatians 2:17, 3:3, 10, 4:21, Ephesians 1:23, 2:3, 4:2, 7, 17, 5:3, Colossians 2:3, 3:14 etc...*

*“No translating committee on earth (for 400 years) have ever translated every Greek word (from any text) **exactly** according to its lexicography (dictionary meaning) as given in a Greek lexicon. All translators “take liberties” in order to get across what **they** think the meaning should be in their language...*

*“Why did [White] allow [the NASV and the NIV] “affirmative action liberties” which he denied to the AV? I will tell you why: a vicious, irrational, Satanic prejudice against the greatest book that ever showed up on this planet. Consider:*

*“When the King’s men substituted “churches” for “temples,” they had just translated the “hieron” of “hierosulos” as “temple” more than fifty times in Matthew-Acts. They knew the root of the word was “temples.” No ignorance was involved. James White pretended they erred through ignorance. He erred through ignorance...*

*“Jimbo’s NIV had just committed this same dastardly “error” in the same chapter, for right at verses 39 and 41 we read “assembly” (NIV) for “church.” But this word was “ekklesia.” The NIV had just translated it as “church” (or “churches”) twenty-two times in Matthew and Acts. Why? If “ecclesia” means “assembly” – and so the NIV and NASV translate it in Acts 19:32, 39, and 41 – what is this same word doing standing as “church” in the rest of the book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles?...*

*““Church” is a dynamic equivalent for “ecclesia.” It is **not** “formal equivalence.” The AV translators **WISELY** chose – intentionally, with full knowledge – “churches” at Acts 19:37 to show you that the heathen who worship female goddesses (see the context!) not only have “temples,” but “churches,” as in St Peter, St Michael’s, St Jude’s, the Lateran, etc. They simply gave you an advanced revelation “not found in the original Greek”!*

*“Poor old Jim White will die declaring the NIV can do things like that, but if the AV does it is an “error”...”*

In other words, White is ‘inconsistent’ and has a ‘double standard.’ Evaluation of his next chapter will reveal yet more deviousness on the part of James White.



## Chapter 6 – “Translational Differences”

This is the first of three chapters in which White conducts an “*examination of the differences that exist between the KJV and other English translations.*” He looks in turn, his emphases, at “*differences that are **translational** in nature...**textual** differences...[and] those differences that relate to the crucial doctrine of the deity of Christ.*”

See **Appendix, Table A1** for the verses that White calls into question in Chapters 6, 7, 8 with respect to the AV1611 readings that White considers to be largely inferior to those of the modern equivalents, NASV, NIV.

In this chapter, White here accuses<sup>3 p 128</sup> bible believers, his emphasis, of “**circular argumentation**...[because] *the assumed standard is the KJV.*” He plaintively asks, “*Why is the KJV the standard? Why not the Geneva Bible, or the Bishop’s Bible, or the Great Bible? Could we not choose any one of these earlier English translations and then make up page after page of comparisons showing how the KJV “altered” this or “changed” that. Certainly we could.*”

Unbeknown to White at the time of his writing, Dr Mrs Riplinger was preparing a detailed work that does precisely that and explains the God-ordained reasons for the changes<sup>39 Parts 2, 5, 6</sup>. See discussion of the King James translators in **Chapter 4** and note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments.

She writes<sup>39 p 131ff</sup>.

“*Professor Allen writes, “...[the King James translators] regarded the Bishops’ text...as a sound one, most of their revision consists in rubbing and polishing...”*”

She states<sup>39 p 560ff</sup> “*“Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did not see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, except this word or that word...’*”

She inserts Dr Smith’s conclusion above – see **Chapter 4** - and continues.

“*The “mark” to which the KJV translators strove was to retain and polish the “perfection of the scriptures” seen in earlier editions. Tyndale himself said of his own edition...“count it as a thing not having his full shape...a thing begun rather than finished...to seek in certain places more proper English”...*”

She also gives<sup>39 p 650ff, 1052ff</sup> numerous examples of the *agreement* between the Texts of the AV1611 and the earlier English Bibles and early (sixteenth century) Bibles in other languages *against* the modern translations. See also her remarks in the previous chapter on the twelve language Nuremberg Polyglot Bible published in 1599 and the verse comparisons that Dr Moorman compiled<sup>9, 11</sup>, which he published several years *before* White’s book appeared.

All of which would answer White’s plaintive questions above, for any honest person, who was prepared to be ‘consistent.’ Moreover, bible believers do not arbitrarily specify the AV1611 as “*the assumed standard.*” The AV1611 is the standard for “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21 because it is the final product of the millennia-long refining process. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks above and Dr Vance’s analysis under **The Revision Conspiracy**.

White is engaging in ‘misrepresentation.’ But he continues, his emphasis.

*“The KJV must stand up to the exact same standards as any other translation. It cannot be made the standard by which all others are judged; it must take its place as one translation among many, so it can be tested just as the NIV or NASB or RSV... Our standard must always be found in the question, “What did the original author of Scriptures say at this point?”... the words of the translators of 1611 may be important, but they **cannot** take precedence over the words were the direct result of divine inspiration.”*

If “*The KJV... cannot be made the standard,*” why do the modern versions that White recommends nevertheless use it as “*the standard*” in order to justify their ‘improvements’?

*“The King James Version has grave defects... so many and so serious as to call for revision of the English translation”* RSV Preface, p iii.

*“The King James Version... became the basis for the English Revised Version [and] the American Standard Version... The New American Standard Bible has sought to preserve [the] lasting values of the ASV”* NASV Preface.

*“A present-day translation is not enhanced by [archaisms] that in the time of the King James Version were used in everyday speech, whether referring to God or man”* NIV Preface, p vii.

*“In harmony with the purpose of the Authorised Version scholars, the translators and editors of the present work... have perceived the Holy Bible, Revised Authorised Version, as a continuation of the labours of the earlier translators”* NKJV Preface, p iii.

Although the modern translators, by definition, do not perceive the Text of the AV1611 as the pure words of God – and their supporter James White obviously sees these words as merely the words of men, not God, i.e. “*the words of the translators of 1611*” – the prefaces to their respective works, including the ones that James White cites, show that, ultimately, they do make the AV1611 “*the standard by which all others are judged,*” in 1881, RV, 1901, ASV, 1946, RSV, 1960, NASV, 1973, NIV, 1979, NKJV.

These observations, which White ignores, clearly vindicate Dr Ruckman’s statement, his emphases<sup>112 p 13</sup> “*the New “King James” Bible, like every English translation since 1884, had to compare itself with the original AV of 1611, for this is the STANDARD that God set up whereby to judge all translations.*”

White asserted<sup>3 p 113</sup> that Dr Ruckman’s statement was “*irrational*” but it is White’s refusal to face evidence such as the above that is irrational. See the previous chapter for his other futile attempts to discredit Dr Ruckman’s evaluation of the modern versions and ‘scholarship onlyism.’

White referred earlier<sup>3 p 48</sup> to Kurt Aland’s description of “*the tenacity of the New Testament text.*” The tenacity of the AV1611 Text is equally apparent, in that it persists as the ultimate basis, or standard, for comparison for each successive new version, even though the purpose of each of these versions is to displace it from being any kind of “*standard.*”

Note that nowhere in the next three chapters does White identify where “*the words... of divine inspiration*” can unequivocally be found between two covers in one volume entitled *Holy Bible*. Again, White demonstrates that he has no ‘bible.’ He merely has the words of modern bible translators and Greek edition editors such as Metzger that he ‘prefers’ over “*the words of the translators of 1611.*”

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 227-8</sup> has this comment on White’s “*standard,*” his emphases.

*“[White] never saw anything “divinely inspired” an hour in his life...No Scholarship Only Advocate believes any Greek manuscript “extant” is inspired. HE is just pretending he has the absolute standard; the original words: all scholarly hypocrites make this pretence. They just don’t dare SAY it.*

*“The standard for a Christian is a “QUESTION,” is it Jimmy? (Gen. 3:1). No question can be a “standard.” A question (Gen. 3:1) can only be something asked in search of a standard...Jimmy lied by giving you a standard that neither he, nor you, can keep, and that he has never kept one day in his life.*

*“Now watch the old hypocrite lie two more times. He has no sooner said “Standard” (singular) than he alters it to “STANDARDS” (plural). No Alexandrian has an absolute “STANDARD” for anything.”*

Note that White refers<sup>3 p vii, 12, 95, 113, 128</sup> successively to “the high standard of truth,” “the standard...the original writings of the prophets,” “truth...the highest standards thereof,” “The KJV has to be tested on the very same [unspecified] basis as any other translation, just as its translators believed and stated in the Preface [which statement is?],” “Our standard must always be found in the question, “What did the original author of Scriptures say at this point?”

Observe that, as Dr Ruckman indicates, “the standard...the original writings of the prophets,” has metamorphosed into a question that White never genuinely answers, “What did the original author of Scriptures say at this point?”

In sum, it is apparent that White himself is “the standard.” See Dr Ruckman’s comment above. But he carefully evades<sup>3 p 129</sup> this implication.

*“It is my intention...to provide representative samples that should allow the reader to apply the general principles that will be discovered to any particular translational difference...”*

“The standard” has now become “the general principles.” White’s ‘standards’ continue to ‘evolve.’

White first objects to the AV1611 reading in Acts 20:28, “to feed” versus the NIV’s “be shepherds,” his emphases.

*“The KJV translates the word that literally means “to shepherd” as “to feed,” which, while acceptable, breaks up the connection between “flock” and “shepherd” in Paul’s thought...Neither translation is “wrong,” they are simply different in certain aspects. By comparison of the two one has a better idea of what Paul said than would a person relying solely on one translation or the other...”*

*“Those who are intent on finding problems with the modern translations may well come up with some reason for finding fault with everything that differs from the AV, but such an activity is based not upon the truth of the matter but upon an inordinate devotion to a particular translation.”*

In the light of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s findings on Greek lexicons, see **Chapter 4**, White’s second paragraph above amounts to wilful ignorance, 1 Corinthians 14:38.

White’s attempt to justify the error in the NIV finds a parallel elsewhere<sup>8 p 159-60</sup>.

*“Concerning “the will of God in pastoral care”, the NIV, JB, NWT and ALL the Greek texts miss the FIRST priority in “pastoral care” as expressed succinctly in the AV1611:*

*““FEED the flock of God which is among you” 1 Peter 5:2.*

*“This exhortation matches perfectly the Lord’s promise in Jeremiah 3:15:*

*“‘And I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall FEED you with knowledge and understanding.’ Note that in the NIV, the pastors only ‘lead’ and do NOT ‘feed’!”*

*“Note that the Lord is INDIGNANT when the sheep are NOT fed, Ezekiel 34:2:*

*“‘Should not the shepherds FEED the flocks?’ Yes, they should but in this verse in the NIV, which reads ‘take care’ instead of ‘feed’, they evidently should NOT!”*

Dr Ruckman writes, his emphases<sup>1 p 276-8</sup> *“On page 129 [of White’s book] we learn that the AV got things screwed up again. Paul wasn’t telling pastors to feed their flocks at all. It was all right to starve them as long as he shepherded them (Acts 20:28). Get nervous every time that ‘feeding’ comes out, don’t they? You are supposed to feed them the word.*

*“‘The AV...breaks up the connection between ‘flock’ and ‘shepherd’ in Paul’s thought’”...*

*“Now White is going to show us Paul’s thinking! Read Acts, chapter 20. The gathering is a gathering of Ephesian pastors (Acts 20:17). A pastor was told to ‘feed the flock’ (1 Pet. 5:2). The ‘original’ was in the English text of John 21:16, and that is why Peter remembered it so well. The ‘flock’ was to be fed the word of God and the WORDS of God (Acts 20:27). Note: ‘taught you publicly’ (not ‘shepherded you’), ‘have gone PREACHING’ (not ‘shepherding’), ‘all the counsel of God,’ and he wound up saying: ‘I commend you [1] GOD, and [2] the WORD OF HIS GRACE’ (Acts 20:32). Paul’s Coda [concluding passage] for these anti-intellectual, anti-Hort, anti-White, anti-scholarship, anti-university remarks was ‘PREACH THE WORD’ (2 Tim. 4:2).*

*“The NIV’s ‘shepherd’ who just ‘shepherds’ sheep, without feeding them, starves them to death (see Ezek. 34:2). White never read the English Bible. The NASV’s ‘shepherd,’ like White, was totally incapable of feeding a jackrabbit, let alone a flock of sheep. That is why he recommended that abomination.”*

White<sup>3 p 130</sup> then asserts the superiority of NASV’s “new self,” also found in the NIV, over “new man” in the AV1611 in Ephesians 4:24, his emphases.

*“Both are perfectly acceptable translations...The KJV is more literal in having ‘new man’ rather than ‘new self,’ and in having ‘after God’ rather than ‘in the likeness of God,’ but the NASB is closer with ‘has been created’ rather than ‘is created.’”*

*“New self” is not a “perfectly acceptable” translation and substitution of “has been created” for “is created” is misleading.*

Dr Ruckman writes<sup>17 p 285-6</sup>.

*“Kenneth Wuest now decides that he has not been called to translate Greek at all, and after writing 10 pages (Preface) on how much more ‘accurate’ his ‘expanded translation’ is going to be, he simply ignores every Greek text extant and translates ‘man’ (anthropon) as ‘self.’ This is NOT the Greek word for ‘self’...”*

*“But the reason why our brethren are having so much trouble with the passage is found in verse 24: ‘put on the new man.’”*

*“You see, the ‘new man’ is Jesus Christ Himself (1 Cor. 15:47, Col. 3:10), and the text (vs. 24) is stating that the original image of Adam – before he fell – was made in the image of Jesus Christ, Who Himself is the ‘image of God’ (Heb. 1:2, 3, 2 Cor. 4:4, 5).*

*Romans 13:14 explained the verse exactly...The logical terminus of this “messing with the word” is the NEB (1961) which goes “all out” with the “new-nature-life-self” bit and winds up by saying that the new nature “shows itself” by living a “just” and “devout life.” But this is not the writing, wording, spelling, meaning, sense, or teaching of the passage. The “new man” (Jesus Christ) is created in “righteousness and true holiness.” And this is the “new man” that the Christian is to “put on.” He is to be worn as a new suit of clothes, and the “old man” (“Adam”) is to be hung up in the closet – **without** the moth balls.”*

Concerning substitution of “has been created” for “**is created**,” Dr Mrs Riplinger warns<sup>14 p 243-4</sup> about the use of expressions such as “has been” or “have been” in the modern versions as “a past completed act that does not necessarily follow into the future” and provides a list of examples, such as Ephesians 2:9, “have been saved,” new versions, versus “**are saved**,” AV1611 and Colossians 2:10, “have been made complete,” new versions, versus “**are complete**,” AV1611.

The expression “has been created” does *not* rule out the possibility of future degeneration. However, the expression “**is created**” does, as Paul explains in 2 Corinthians 4:16.

**“For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.”**

(The NASV, NKJV have “*is being renewed*” and the NIV has “*are being renewed*” instead of “**is renewed**.” Both modern renderings are weaker than that of the AV1611. They imply that the renewal is on going but not necessarily fulfilled “**day by day**” as in the AV1611.)

The King James translators used the expression “**hath been**,” equivalent to the modern versions’ “has been,” a total of 14 times in the AV1611, so they clearly inserted it wherever it was deemed necessary.

They used the expression on seven occasions in Paul’s Epistles; Romans 11:34, 16:2, 1 Corinthians 1:11, Galatians 3:1, Ephesians 3:9, Colossians 1:26, Titus 1:9. Each time it refers to a past completed event, or past completed events, some of which, according to the context, pertain to the present, e.g. Ephesians 3:9 or may be renewed in the future, e.g. Romans 16:2. But the expression is distinct from a continuous present fulfilment, such as the AV1611’s “**is created**” in Ephesians 4:24.

White maintains that, “*Very rarely is the reason [for any particular translation] to be found in conspiratorial theories or attempts to alter God’s truth in Scripture.*”

So far, the modern alternatives to the AV1611 readings that White attempts to justify:

- Detract from the pastor’s first priority to “**feed the flock**”
- Obscure the identity of “**the new man**” in the believer as the Lord Jesus Christ
- Cast doubt even upon the permanence of “**the new man**” in the believer.

Clearly these are “*conspiratorial...attempts to alter God’s truth in Scripture.*”

Or as the serpent said in Genesis 3:1, “**Yea, hath God said?**”

White now seeks once again<sup>3 p 131-2</sup> to denigrate Dr Mrs Riplinger’s research<sup>14 p 256</sup> by insertion of one of her charts, which White describes as part of “*this desperate search for conspiracies...[alleging] that the new versions are presenting a “works-salvation” system.*”

He adds, in apparent amazement, “*I have written entire books defending salvation by grace through faith that utilized translations other than the KJV, as have many others. How can this be?...Men who strongly believe in salvation by grace alone have been involved in the translation of many of the modern versions. How could they be convinced (and by whom?) to sacrifice their beliefs by allegedly mistranslating the text?...*”

“*For example, the first citation given is Romans 5:4, where the KJV has “And patience, experience,” while the NIV has “perseverance, character”...the word that is found in the Greek text means “patient endurance, steadfastness, perseverance.” Are we to think that God does not engender perseverance and steadfastness in the Christian character? Surely not. The NIV translation is just as acceptable, if not more so, than the KJV’s.*”

White’s comments immediately prompt the question, which scriptures did White use to defend “*salvation by grace through faith [utilizing] translations other than the KJV?*”

White fails to answer this question. Dr Ruckman writes<sup>1 p 188-9</sup>, his emphases, in answer to White’s amazed question, “*How can this be?*”

“*All you had to do was quote the verses that **DIDN’T teach a works salvation**, and avoid the ones that **did**...There are more than 100 verses in the AV that teach a faith-and-works “plan of salvation.” How could you have read...the works of John Wesley or Jacob Arminius and not have **known this**? Wesley cites the AV: so did Sam Jones, Peter Cartwright, Francis Asbury, and every Methodist preacher in America who taught a “works” system.” White doesn’t know church history...*”

It is edifying to compare Dr Ruckman’s works *Eternal Security* and *The Big Flap* to see a correct division of the scriptures, 2 Timothy 2:15, with respect to Church Age salvation, or salvation by grace through faith in the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, Ephesians 1:6, 7, Colossians 1:13, 14 and Tribulation Salvation, or a system of conditional salvation based faith and works, Revelation 12:17, 14:12. See also Matthew 24:13, “**But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.**”

Turning to White’s comment on Romans 5:4, however much he favours the NIV, he cannot dispute the correct distinction that Dr Mrs Riplinger draws between the words “*perseverance*” and “*patience*” as “*work*” and “*wait*” respectively.

And his fixation with “*the word that is found in the Greek text*” prevents him from the following the method “**which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual,**” 1 Corinthians 2:13b, i.e. comparing scripture with scripture, in order to discern which translation “*is acceptable.*”

The expression “*perseverance, character*” suggests that the Christian must strive to be a better individual, or develop “*character,*” in order to be worthy of “*hope,*” ultimately the hope of heaven. The NIV rendering therefore implies that full salvation is dependent on the Christian working for it, as Dr Mrs Riplinger warns – and as the footnote reading of the NIV implies in verse 1, with “*let us have peace,*” i.e. work for it, instead of “*we have peace,*” i.e. we have it. It is right and proper to mention the footnote with respect to the NIV reading in Romans 5:1, which the NIV applies to verses 2, 3 as well, because James White insists<sup>3 p 77</sup> that “*The importance of marginal notes to the KJV Only controversy should note be overlooked.*” The NIV footnote for Romans 5:1 is found in the texts of the DR, JR and the NWT.

The AV1611 reading indicates that by patience, or “**longsuffering,**” the believer accumulates a fund of personal encounters with the goodness of God in successive deliverances,

such that he is encouraged unto ***“the patient waiting for Christ”*** 2 Thessalonians 3:5b, or ***“that blessed hope”*** Titus 2:13.

That is why Paul wrote in 2 Corinthians 1:9, 10 ***“But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us.”***

Paul described some of his ***“longsuffering,” “patience”*** and ***“experience”*** in 2 Corinthians 6:5-10, 11:23-12:10, at the end of which he could testify ***“And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen”*** 2 Timothy 4:18.

That was Paul’s ***“hope”*** derived from his share of ***“patience”*** and ***“experience.”***

The AV1611 translation is therefore ***“acceptable”*** and the NIV alternative, which obscures the above, is not.

White then charges<sup>3 p 132</sup> the AV1611 with inconsistency ***“in the KJV’s translation of terms.”*** With reference again to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s chart<sup>14 p 256</sup> and 2 Timothy 2:12, White states, his emphases, ***“The term “endure” in the modern translations is contrasted with “suffer” in the KJV, and the assertion is that this somehow presents a “works-salvation” concept. Yet, the Greek term that is found here... [is] a term that even the KJV itself translates as “endure” [at] 1 Corinthians 13:7 [“endureth all things”]...The KJV translates the very same term that is found at 2 Timothy 2:12 as “endureth” here in 1 Corinthians. If our writer is consistent doesn’t this then teach a “works-salvation” system as well?”***

Again, White’s fixation with ***“the Greek term”*** prevents him from having his understanding opened that he ***“might understand the scriptures”*** Luke 24:45. Note first that in his determination to discredit the AV1611, he has tried to insinuate that the AV1611 wording should be changed, according to ***“the Greek text,”*** so that the verse ***can be forced*** to teach a ***““works-salvation” system,”*** when it does not. Anything to discredit the AV1611.

Note further that 1 Corinthians 13:4 states ***“Charity suffereth long,”*** and therefore gives the sense of the term ***“endureth”*** in verse 7, illustrated by the life of Abraham in Hebrews 6:15, ***“And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise.”*** So, contrary to White’s insinuation, ***“endureth”*** in the context of 1 Corinthians 13:4-7 ***does*** match ***“suffer”*** in 2 Timothy 2:12.

Concerning White’s rhetorical question above, Dr Ruckman writes<sup>1 p 190-2</sup>, his emphases, ***“White accuses the AV of teaching a works-salvation system in 2 Timothy 2:12. The reasoning...is that the word for “endureth” in 1 Corinthians [13] – which has NOTHING to do with anyone’s salvation – is found in 2 Timothy 2:12, although it is translated there as “suffer”...”***

***“There are more than 100 verses in the AV that clearly indicate a “works set up,” and they occur in every translation of every edition of every Bible on earth, but NONE of them are in 2 Timothy...they are in Matthew, chapters 24-25; Hebrews, chapters 3, 6, 10; John, chapter 15; 1 John, chapters 3-4; 2 Peter, chapters 2-3; Romans, chapter 11; and Revelation, chapters 2-3, 12, 14, and 22...”***

Matthew 24:13 is an example, speaking of Tribulation Salvation and using the term ***“endure”*** in the correct context, ***“But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.”*** Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Second Timothy 2:12 was interpreted by the Holy Spirit (Scripture with Scripture) in Romans 8:17; 1 Corinthians 6:9; Ephesians 5:5; and Colossians 3:24... It was a reference to a Christian enduring suffering for Christ’s sake, in this life, in order to earn a shared reign in an earthly Kingdom (Luke 19:12-20; Rev. 5:10, 20:1-3)...“Salvation by works” was not found in the passage.”*

White has also overlooked the connection between *“If we suffer, we shall also reign with him”* 2 Timothy 2:12 and *“Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation”* Romans 12:12, where the believer’s *“hope”* will be fulfilled in the *“reign”* following his suffering, or patience in tribulation, resting in the Lord’s assurance that *“My grace is sufficient for thee.”* 2 Corinthians 12:9.

Without the above qualifications, the term *“endure”* can simply denote lasting, or going on indefinitely, without necessarily indicating being *“patient in tribulation”* as the term *“suffer”* does, because Psalm 9:7a states *“But the Lord shall endure forever.”*

And as Peter admonishes, again with an emphasis on trusting in the Lord’s mercy, *“Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to him in well doing as unto a faithful creator”* 1 Peter 4:19.

Compare the admonition of Peter, which matches those of Paul in Romans 12:12, 2 Timothy 2:12 with the self-interest of Abner, who sought to endure or last out through a civil war for his own ends. Abner’s enduring did not include suffering *“according to the will of God.”*

*“Now there was a long war between the house of Saul and the house of David...And it came to pass, while there was war between the house of Saul and the house of David, that Abner made himself strong for the house of Saul”* 2 Samuel 3:1, 6.

After his dispute with Ishbosheth, Abner clearly had designs on securing the king’s special favour in his decision *“to translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah”* 2 Samuel 3:10a.

While this decision would benefit the nation as a whole, it is noteworthy nevertheless that Abner *“made himself strong”* in contrast to *“a Christian enduring suffering for Christ’s sake.”* See Dr Ruckman’s comment above. Abner’s ambition illustrates the distinction that Dr Mrs Riplinger has sought to draw in her chart between simply enduring (NIV) with being *“patient in tribulation...according to the will of God”* (AV1611), i.e. suffering. However *“the Greek term”* may be translated, the AV1611 reading *“suffer”* gives the correct emphasis, whereas the NIV’s *“endure”* does not.

White also cites Hebrews 10:23 in this context and claims erroneously, his emphasis, that *“the modern translations are much more accurate than the...misleading translation of the KJV at this point. The same could be said of the other passages that are cited...”*

The above discussion shows that it is the modern versions that are *“misleading,”* not the AV1611. Dr Ruckman’s study of Hebrews 10:23 in the previous chapter addresses White’s *“misleading translation”* of this verse.

White now cites another of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s charts<sup>14 p 255</sup>, although he does not explicitly designate it as such. This chart lists the verses John 3:36, Romans 11:32, 15:31, Hebrews 3:18, 4:6, 11 and contrasts the AV1611 readings such as *“believeth not”* and *“unbelief”* with the modern readings such as *“not obey”* and *“disobedience,”* found particularly in the NASV. See *Appendix 1, Table A1*.



White complains, his emphasis, that “*KJV Only advocates often allege that the use of terms related to obedience by the NASB in translating the particular Greek term that is translated “believe” many times in the KJV, John 3:36 being the prime example, is indicative of a tendency toward “works-salvation” on the part of the modern translations...this is untrue. First the KJV itself translates the very same term using “obey” in...1 Peter 3:1, 4:17, and Romans 2:8. Secondly the translation “disobey” is the primary meaning of the term...finally, there is no conflict between obedience to Christ and belief in Christ.*”

White also tries<sup>3 p 133, 147</sup> to tar the AV1611 with the same “works-salvation” brush that has besmirched the modern versions with the statement that “*Men have used the KJV to promote the very same error [of works-salvation] for centuries. The KJV is the favorite version of a number of groups that promote works-salvation.*” He cites the Mormons as an example but neglects to mention, in spite of his apparent knowledge of Mormonism, that this group also utilises the *Book of Mormon* to propagate its false doctrines (a situation reminiscent of James White and his<sup>3 p 7</sup> “multiple translations of the Bible...[that] will allow the student of the Bible to get a firm grasp upon the meaning of any particular passage”).

Aside from examining scriptures that *do* describe salvation based in part on works in times outside the Church Age – see Dr Ruckman’s comments above – White would do well to consider Dr Ruckman’s experience during the early days of his ministry, in 1951, when he witnessed first-hand how “*Men have used the KJV to promote the very same error [of works-salvation]*” and to promote other false doctrines as well, e.g. that the Lord Jesus Christ is not “*God...manifest in the flesh*” 1 Timothy 3:16 but a mere man.

Dr Ruckman describes<sup>101 p 354-6</sup> how he debated for eight hours with an elderly man who could ‘use’ the AV1611 to ‘prove’ every heresy in existence, including the works-based plans of salvation of the Mormons and the Jehovah’s Witnesses.

And Dr Ruckman makes this startling observation about his opponent, his emphases.

*“When I reviewed in my mind what I had been through, it suddenly dawned on me that every verse the man had quoted he had changed at least a word, or a letter, or a phrase from the Authorized Version, even though that was the text he was using.”*

That is how men ‘use’ “*the KJV to promote error.*” They change its wording to suit their ‘preferences,’ much as James White does.

In response to White’s first objection, each of the verses that he cites with respect to the AV1611’s use of the word “*obey*” is a reference to obeying – or disobeying – *the scripture*.

Romans 2:8 refers to “*them that...do not obey the truth,*” with “*the truth*” defined by the Lord Jesus Christ in John 17:17, “*thy word is truth,*” and reaffirmed in Romans 1:18, 25, because men held it in unrighteousness and changed it into a lie. These are two more verses that White disputes in the AV1611. See remarks in the previous chapter. His departures from the AV1611 in these verses have led him further astray.

**“Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap”** Galatians 6:7.

1 Peter 3:1, 4:17 refer to men that “*obey not the word*” and “*obey not the gospel of God,*” that gospel being part of “*the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:23, 25.

David testifies that the Lord *“hast magnified thy word above all thy name”* Psalm 138:2. *“Thy word”* is therefore finally authoritative. It is *“the word by which the gospel is preached unto you”* 1 Peter 1:25 and it is *“the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus”* 2 Timothy 3:15b.

In its fully refined form, *“Thy word”* is the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.

Therefore any individual who seeks salvation should obey *“thy word”* as it sets out the plan of salvation for any age, whether it is to *“believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved”* Acts 16:31, as in the Church Age, 2 Timothy 3:15 above, or to follow a faith-works system, as in the Tribulation, Matthew 24:13 and *“endure unto the end.”*

The AV1611’s use of *“obey”* in these verses is therefore entirely correct and does not conflict with its use of *“believeth”* in John 3:36 in translation of *“the very same [Greek] term.”*

The pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible agrees with the AV1611 in John 3:36. See *Appendix, Table A16*. Note that the words of the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible<sup>39 p 712</sup> *“probably date from the 1<sup>st</sup> century.”* Note further that all passages or readings cited with pre-350 AD Gothic Bible and/or pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible support, as listed in *Table A16*, are found in the faithful precursors to the AV1611; the Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops’ Bibles and often Wycliffe’s Bible.

White disposes of his second objection himself, with the statement that the AV1611 *“is not giving the most literal translation”* but he gives no reason why it must do so and further comment is unnecessary.

White’s third objection, namely that *“there is no conflict between obedience to Christ and belief in Christ”* ignores the fact that *“If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us”* 1 John 1:8.

Paul’s belief in the Lord Jesus Christ never faltered but he went up to Jerusalem, even after several disciples *“said to Paul through the Spirit that he should not go up to Jerusalem”* Acts 21:4. Paul’s disobedience cost him two years out of his ministry<sup>88 p 611, 681</sup>, Acts 24:27, because *“Felix, willing to shew the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound.”*

White neglects to mention Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments<sup>14 p 254-5</sup> on this list of verses, which effectively answer his objections.

*“Even the NIV and NASB render apeitheo as ‘unbelief’ in Acts 14:2, conceding the appropriateness of this translation.”*

She illustrates how *“much study of the new versions”* can lead a Christian into error with respect to salvation and cites the case of Jimmy Swaggart, who wrote, *““The durability of his justifying grace is on the basis of obedience to God. A person can lose his salvation through neglect or disobedience.””*

Dr Mrs Riplinger adds that Swaggart got his salvation back after his ‘fall.’ The above statement nevertheless illustrates how alteration of the words of the AV1611 can lead to major heresies, as Dr Ruckman observed – see comments above.

The *“tendency toward “works-salvation” on the part of the modern translations”* is therefore a fact, regardless of White’s attempts at denial.

White then alludes to another list of verses; Acts 2:47, 1 Corinthians 1:18, 2 Corinthians 2:15, 4:3, Ephesians 4:22, adding that in each case *“the Greek”* has *“present participles.”* See *Appendix, Table A1* for the contrasting readings between the AV1611 and the

modern versions, where the NIV readings essentially match those of the NASV that White uses for comparison with the AV1611.

With reference to this list, White declares that, his emphases, *“The Bible is plain in presenting the “now and the not yet” aspect of salvation. We **are** saved, and yet we are **being** saved, and we **will be** saved...This is a case where the modern translations are more literal, and more correct, than the KJV...*

*“It is obvious that those “who are perishing” are in the process of doing so and have not, as yet, completed that process...Paul obviously parallels “those who are being saved” with “those who are perishing” in both 1 Corinthians 1:18 and 2 Corinthians 2:15. If the process of perishing is ongoing, so is the process of being saved in the same contexts. The KJV rendering of these passages, while technically allowable, does not do a very good job in expressing the intention of the author in these places. And...we must be continually reminded that our theology must be derived **from** the text of Scripture, not forced **onto** it. If Paul said we are “being saved” in 1 Corinthians 1:18, he also said that we “have been saved” in Ephesians 2:5, and that we “shall be saved” in Romans 5:9, 10...We dare not allow our theology to determine our translation, which, sadly, is what we have in many KJV Only presentations.”*

Though White gives no examples of any such presentations. However, he appears to have extracted the first four of the verses listed above from another of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s charts, once again – see above – without explicating referring to it.

This oversight on White’s part conveniently enables him to sidestep Dr Mrs Riplinger’s evaluation<sup>8 p 173-4, 14 p 244-5</sup> of the modern present-participle readings.

*““Hort and the new version editors who, “have been saved” at baptism, have a spokesman today in Alan Schreck, author of “Catholic and Christian”.*

*“““Evangelical Protestants will sometimes ask a Catholic acquaintance, ‘Have you been saved?’...The question seems to suggest that a person’s salvation is a once-and-for-all event that happens in a single moment, rather than a process...I believe that a Catholic can adequately answer the question. The Catholic can say that, ‘I have been saved (Catholic baptism); I am being saved’ (works, obedience, perseverance).”*

*““The new versions echo Schreck saying, “have been saved” (Eph 2:8) and “are being saved” (1 Cor. 1:18 et al.). In both of these verses the KJV says “**are saved**”, which clearly describes the once-for-all-event that occurs when Jesus Christ is received as Saviour. One can only ask, are the new versions Catholic or Christian? Notice how the new versions present the process theology of the New Age and apostate Christianity where initiation commences an incessant course conveying one to salvation.*

<b>NIV</b>	<b>Verse</b>	<b>KJV</b>
were being saved	Acts 2:47	<b>should be saved</b>
are turning to God	Acts 15:19	<b>are turned</b>
are being saved	1 Cor. 1:18	<b>are saved</b>
are being saved	2 Cor. 2:15	<b>are saved</b>
are perishing	2 Cor. 4:3	<b>are lost</b>
is being renewed	Col. 3:10	<b>is renewed</b>
is passing	1 John 2:8	<b>is past</b>

““Dean Burgon, noted Greek scholar, comments on the “are being saved” and “have been saved” rendition of the Greek verbs.

“““The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far...Examples of their inconsistency reduces the whole matter to a question of Taste...The vast number of cases in which they have forsaken their own rule shows that it could not be followed without changing elements of the original... They virtually admit that they have been all along unjustly forcing on an independent language an alien yoke.””

“See *The Revision Revised* p 154ff. The NIV translators appear to have heeded Burgon’s admonitions in Matthew 2:6, 7, 9, 23. However they retained the un-idiomatic RV readings in Matthew 2:1, 2, 12 (omitting “**of God**”), 13, upon which Burgon comments in detail.

“Mrs Riplinger concludes “Foster of the NIV and NKJV committees agrees, (with Burgon) admitting, “This in itself results in an unnatural straining of the tenses of the English.” However, the doctrinal bend of the translator tends toward a progressive kind of salvation and this is reflected in their versions.””

So according to a genuine scholar such as Dean Burgon, although the new versions, including the Catholic JB, are “*more literal*,” they are not “*more correct*.”

The AV1611 readings both satisfy the idiomatic renderings and accurately describe “*the once-for-all-event that occurs when Jesus Christ is received as Saviour*.” In so doing, they avoid the ambiguity of New Age “*process theology*” implicit in the readings of the new versions.

Note White’s misleading statement with respect to 2 Corinthians 4:3, “*those “who are perishing” are in the process of doing so and have not, as yet, completed that process*.” The fact is, they “**are lost**.” The lost are already “**dead in trespasses and sins**” Ephesians 2:1b, not simply dying. Even the NIV is unambiguous in this respect.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>8 p 171-2, 14 p 242-3</sup> answers White’s notion that “we “*have been saved*” in Ephesians 2:5” as follows. (Instead of Ephesians 2:5, she cites verse 8, which has the same reading, “**are saved**” (AV1611) versus “*have been saved*” (NIV).)

““Philip Schaff, at the hub of the ‘New’ Greek and ASV, was tried for heresy by his denomination for his belief in baptism/initiation regeneration. From his hub, spokes like the Living Bible and NASV moved this creed into the next century. Hort peddled the same heresy:

“““I am a staunch sacerdotalist...Paul connected the state (salvation) with a PAST COMPLETED act (baptism) by which it was formerly taken possession of.”

““See this “past completed” action of baptism in the NASV, NIV and all new versions. Their verbs are mistranslated, as even the preface of the NASB Interlinear Greek-English New Testament admits:

“““The Authorized Version is idiomatically correct.”

““Christians “are saved” (present tense) when they receive Jesus as Saviour. The new versions present baptism/initiation views as intended by their editors, a past completed act that does not necessarily follow into the present.””

The modern readings clearly allow for the heretical “*baptism/initiation views*” of Schaff and Hort. White must have read these sections of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work but he has avoided attempting to discuss them adequately.

It is therefore not the AV1611 but James White who “*does not do a very good job in expressing the intention of the author in these places.*”

Dr Ruckman<sup>119 p 213-216</sup> has some informative comments on Romans 5:9, 10, his emphases.

““**Saved**” here is in the future tense “**shall be.**” The word “**wrath**” here not only refers to the future of the sinner in Hell and the Lake of Fire (Matthew 3:11-12, 13:40), but it also refers to the Second Advent (1 Thessalonians 5:2-9; Revelation 6:16-17, 19:15) and the Great White Throne Judgement (Revelation 11:17-18)...

“The unsaved man is born into the world as a child of God’s wrath (Ephesians 2:3). All through his natural life, he lives under **the wrath of God** (John 3:36). And the unsaved man is appointed to God’s wrath (1 Thessalonians 5:9). But upon receiving Christ, a person becomes a son of God. He is in Jesus Christ, so he is “**blessed...with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ**” (Ephesians 1:3)...

“Notice also that “saved” comes in three tenses. You **have been** saved, you **are being** saved, and you “**shall be saved**” (as in verse 9). The Christian’s salvation is past, present and future.

“When you received Jesus Christ as your Saviour and placed your faith in His blood atonement on the cross, you **were saved**. **That was the past tense**. That is a past sanctification. Hebrews 10:10, “**By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.**”

“Then there is a present sanctification. It is practical, day-by-day...Christ said [John 17:17], “**Sanctify them with thy truth: thy word is truth.**” Paul told the Philippians to “**work out your own salvation with fear and trembling**” (Philippians 2:12)...Paul...is not telling you to do good works to get to Heaven. He is telling you to show your salvation to others by doing good works.

“Finally, there is sanctification that is complete at the Rapture of the Church. “**I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ**” (1 Thessalonians 5:23). When that takes place, your body is changed (1 Corinthians 15) and is no longer that old nature subject to sin. It too is then saved.

“So salvation is **past** in that you were saved from the punishment of sin **at Calvary**. You are **being saved** from the power of sin in your daily life as you put on the new man and reckon yourself dead to sin and alive to God. That is salvation in the present tense. Some day, in the future, you will be saved **completely** from the very presence of sin when Christ takes you on home to Heaven...

“Notice, again, in verse 10 that past and present tense in one of the operations of salvation. This time it is reconciliation. “**We were reconciled to God**” (past) by the death of Christ; we are “**being reconciled**” (present) by Christ’s life; and “**we shall be saved by his life**” (future tense). The fact that Jesus Christ is alive right now is what continues to save us. Hebrews 7:25, “**Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them**”...

“The Lord Jesus Christ makes continual intercession for us before the Father...He keeps bringing up the blood and reminding the Father that the price has been paid...

*“If Christ didn’t live **in** you as well, you would have no “hope of glory” (Colossians 1:27). It is Christ’s living presence **in your body** that gives life to the new man, that keeps the soul, and that claims that body for His own at t e resurrection.”*

Although Dr Ruckman uses the same terms with respect to salvation that White does, he qualifies this usage with reference to sanctification, which White fails to do. Thus the AV1611 readings are both idiomatically correct and theologically correct, while avoiding any scope for heretical “*baptism/initiation views*” – see above – in its modes of expression.

Again, it is not the KJV but James White, who “*does not do a very good job in expressing the intention of the author in these places.*”

White next criticises Dr Mrs Riplinger’s allusion<sup>14 p 246</sup> to Ephesians 2:1 “*as evidence that the new versions “present a progressive, tentative salvation.”*” See **Appendix, Table A1**.

White argues that, his emphases, “*the KJV **translation** is rather unusual since it borrows a phrase that is not found until verse 5 in the Greek and transposes it into verse 1. All the modern versions have the relevant phrase in its proper place in verse 5. Nothing has been “left out,” and certainly the unwillingness of modern versions to engage in the same creative translation as the KJV indicates nothing about their alleged lack of orthodoxy.*”

White neglects to inform the reader that the AV1611 also has “*the relevant phrase in its proper place in verse 5.*” It did not ‘transpose’ the phrase to verse 1 but inserted a similar phrase in italics, giving the saved reader assurance that he “***is passed from death unto life***” John 5:24 and providing in English a principal clause for the extended statement in verses 1-3. A literal rendering<sup>62</sup> of “*the Greek,*” also followed by Nestle, has “*being dead*” in verse 1, indicating that the verse requires an idiomatic, not “*creative,*” translation for correct grammar in English. The King James translators therefore rightly included the phrase “***hath he quickened***” in italics in verse 1 and followed it with the adjectival clause “***who were dead in trespasses and sins,***” no doubt thereby satisfying “*the Greek*” and reassuring the saved reader of salvation (though not James White’s ingrained prejudice against the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible).

The modern versions create a principal clause in verse 1 but leave the saved reader “*dead in...trespasses and sins*” until verse 5. Dr Mrs Riplinger is thus correct in her observations about Ephesians 2:1 and the other verses listed in this particular chart.

She states further<sup>7 Part 4</sup>, “*White wants to convince his readers that the three words “hath he quickened,” in Eph. 2:1 are not necessary; he suggests the reader merely JUMP FIVE VERSES LATER to Eph. 2:5 to “hath quickened us.” The theological problems evade White. Verse 1 is about “you”; verse 5 is about “us”. Also the new versions’ verse 5 ends with “You **have been** saved”; the KJV ends with “ye **are** saved.” Two points are critical. 1.) “You” cannot be saved in verse 5 unless “you” were quickened in verse 1. 2.) One does not join the “we” of verse 5 automatically; “you” must be born again. In conclusion: The omission of the three words and the substitution of “have been” for “are” presents a completely different soteriology - precisely the subject of the chapter in which this verse was discussed (viz. baptismal regeneration heresy).*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes further that Ephesians 2:1 in the AV1611 is supported by the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible. See **Appendix, Table A16**.

White<sup>3 p 135-6</sup> now accesses another of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s charts<sup>14 p 283</sup>, with only minor changes, in order to cast doubt on the reading “***world***” in the AV1611 versus “*age*” or “*ages*” in the NASV, NIV, from “*aion*” in “*the Greek.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger lists Matthew 12:32, 28:20, Mark 10:30, Luke 18:30, 20:35, Galatians 1:4, Ephesians 1:21, Titus 2:12, Revelation 15:3. White lists the underlined verses apart from Revelation 15:3. See *Appendix, Table A1* – and *Chapter 4* for comments on Revelation 15:3, where White has disputed the AV1611 reading separately.

The pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible supports the AV1611's use of "**world**" wherever it occurs in the New Testament. See *Appendix, Table A16*.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *In Awe of Thy Word*, this line of Bibles illustrates the faithful preservation of the scriptures down through the centuries from the utterance of the scriptures in "**other tongues**" on the day of Pentecost as described in Acts 2.

However, White insists, his emphasis, that "*the most basic, literal translation of the term aion in these contexts is "age" ...to refer to a specific **age**, a specific period of time.*"

White alludes to the NKJV's use of "age" and "age to come" in Matthew 12:32 and the NASV's use of "end of the age" in Matthew 13:49, 24:3 and "evil age" in Galatians 1:4. The AV1611 has "**world**" instead of "age" in each of these verses. See *Appendix, Table A1*.

White attempts to justify the modern alternatives on the basis that "*In these passages, then, "age" refers to a definite period of time, one in which we now live (this present evil age), and one which is yet future... "the age to come," that is, the eternal state... The KJV's use of "world" is certainly less clear than the modern "age," for it allows for allows for confusion between the intended meanings of the authors of Scripture. One must consult lexicons and concordances to discover if the text is speaking of the world around us (the other Greek term, kosmos) or the present evil age (aion). This ambiguity is cleared up in modern translations.*"

Once again, White reveals his own 'inconsistency' and 'double standard,' in that, having accused<sup>3 p 95ff</sup> Dr Mrs Riplinger of "*misrepresentation,*" he fails to represent her stance on these verses at all because once again – see above - he omits any reference to the book *New Age Versions* from which he has gleaned the verses listed.

These are some of Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments, with her emphases, that James White did not want his readers to see.

*"Luciferian, H. P. Blavatsky said, "Both Jesus and St John the Baptist preached the end of the Age...So little did the **uninitiated Christians** understand that they accepted the words of Jesus literally and firmly believed he meant the end of the world." (Isis, Vol. II, p. 144) Her initiate Alice Bailey therefore concluded that Matthew 28:20 should read, "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the age." (Reappearance, p 38) Today, the new version 'initiates' and the "uninitiated Christians" still present these opposite world views."*

Just as bible believers and James White present opposite views on "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21 and will no doubt continue to do so until the Rapture.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further<sup>7 Part 5</sup> her emphases "[White's] pretense of "correctly translating the term for age" misses the **fact** that new versions often translate aiona and aionos as 'world.' Are new versions 'incorrect' in those places? The fact is, the word can refer to **both** time (age) and space (world) depending on the context. The KJV gives no entre to New Age cosmology and wisely ignored some of the Greek neo-Platonic lexical writings which see time as cyclical."

Concerning *“the world to come”* Matthew 12:32, Mark 10:30, Luke 18:30, 20:35, Ephesians 1:21 and *“the end of the world”* Matthew 13:49, 24:3, 28:20, White forgets that:

**“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away”** Matthew 24:35

**“But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgement and perdition of ungodly men”** 2 Peter 3:7

**“And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever”** 1 John 2:17

**“Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness”** 2 Peter 3:13

**“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea”** Revelation 21:1.

Concerning *“this present evil world”* Galatians 1:4, Titus 2:12, White forgets what the Lord Jesus Christ said, together with the apostles John and Paul.

**“The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil”** John 7:7

**“For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places”** Ephesians 6:12

**“Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world”** 1 John 2:15, 16

**“And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness”** 1 John 5:19.

This entire world will end, not just the current ‘age’ and this world is evil, regardless of whatever ‘age’ it is passing through.

Even the NIV and NASV acknowledge the accuracy of the AV1611 with respect to the above readings, although White fails to inform his readers of this acknowledgement.

The King James translators saw the big picture and translated accordingly. James White didn’t and therefore couldn’t.

White<sup>3 p 137</sup> now makes the astounding statement that *“One of the most obvious differences in translation focuses upon the use of the word “hell” in the KJV. Unfortunately, cultic groups such as Jehovah’s Witnesses have made great use of the KJV’s ambiguous rendering of words that have to do with the afterlife...any person examining the facts without a vested interest in defending the KJV has to admit that this is one place in which many modern translations far surpass the KJV in accuracy.”*

As will be seen when *“the facts”* are examined, *“many modern translations”* don’t even approach *“the KJV in accuracy.”*

White conveniently supplies the information that the AV1611 uses the word **“hell”** 54 times, *“31 times in the Old Testament, and 23 times in the New.”* It translates *sheol* as **“hell”** in the Old Testament, *gehenna* 12 times as **“hell”** in the New Testament and *hades* 12 times as such and *tartarus* as **“hell”** in 2 Peter 2:4.



White maintains that *“The word sheol in the Hebrew is best translated by the Greek term hades. Both terms refer to the “realm of the dead,” which at times can simply refer to the grave, or at times to the world of shadows as seen in Isaiah 14:9-15 [or]...the place of departed spirits in Luke 16:19-31. KJV Only advocates will often attack the use of the term “grave” by modern translators, yet the KJV translators themselves recognised that the Hebrew term sheol did not always refer to “hell,” for they often translated it by other terms.”*

White gives only one example to back up this assertion, namely Genesis 37:35, where *sheol* is translated as **“the grave.”** Young<sup>71</sup> indicates that *sheol* appears 31 times in the AV1611 as **“grave”** and 3 times as **“pit.”** Reference to this limited amount of variation as *sheol* being *“often translated it by other terms”* is stretching the truth somewhat but White insists, his emphasis, that the AV1611 displays *“inconsistency”* because *“sheol and hades are not synonyms for the Greek term gehenna, which really does mean “hell” in the traditional sense.”*

White assumes that Revelation 20:13-14\* in the modern versions reveals the distinction because *“death and hades are cast into the lake of fire. What is the lake of fire if it is not hell itself? And how does one cast hell into hell? Instead, in this example we have hades, the realm of the dead, being differentiated from the lake of fire by the biblical text itself.”*

No, we have **“death and hell”** *“being differentiated from the lake of fire by the biblical text itself.”* Further explanation will follow but for now, White concludes, *“groups that deny the existence of hell have utilized the KJV’s rendering of passages that obviously are referring to the grave, not the lake of fire, as “hell” to obscure the Scripture’s testimony to the reality of everlasting punishment. While the KJV’s translation of these terms is certainly unfortunate, should we cast blame upon them and accuse them of all sorts of evil and heresy...? Certainly not. Yet...much of the argumentation presented by KJV Only advocates, if it were consistently applied, would force them to do just that!”*

White gives no explanation of why this should be so.

\*See **Appendix, Table A1.** The NASV follows the NIV reading *Hades*.

It should also be noted that where differentiation was necessary between different ‘compartments’ in the abode of the dead, the King James translators were easily able to do so from *“the Greek”* by means of terms such as **“Abraham’s bosom”** Luke 16:22 and **“paradise”** Luke 23:43.

White does not elaborate on his note<sup>3 p 147</sup> about the *Watchtower Bible and Tract Society* publication that apparently *“utilized the KJV’s rendering of passages that obviously are referring to the grave...as “hell” to obscure the Scripture’s testimony to the reality of everlasting punishment.”* White fails to list these passages or to show how Watchtower has misapplied them, so an informed response to White’s insistence that **“hell”** in the AV1611 should sometimes be translated as *“grave”* is not possible at this time.

Nevertheless, overall, a different picture emerges – as usual - when *“the argumentation”* against James White’s assertions is *“consistently applied.”*

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 188</sup> addressed the readings of **“hell”** versus *“hades”* as follows and by inspection, counters much of White’s argument, which is similar in many respects to that of ‘our critic.’

*“The AV1611 consistently translates “hades” as “hell” in Matthew 11:23, 16:18; Luke 10:15, 16:23; Acts 2:27, 31; Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14. It translates “geena” as*

**“hell”** in Matthew 5:22, 29, 30, 10:18, 18:9, 23:15, 22; Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Luke 12:5; James 3:6 and **“tartaroo”** as **“hell”** in 2 Peter 2:4.

*“For “hades”, the NIV has “depths, Hades, depths, hell, grave (twice), Hades (4 times)”. The JB has “hell, underworld, hell, Hades (3 times), underworld, Hades (3 times)”.*

*“Although the word “geena” has been translated as “hell” by the modern versions, their reluctance to express “hades” as “HELL” is all too apparent. They have a distinct tendency not to translate at all but to TRANSLITERATE.*

*“Dr. Ruckman<sup>18 p 147-148</sup> states: “It is objected that **“Hell”** (for “hades” and “gehenna”) is improper. To correct this “error,” the new bibles read “Hades” for “Hell” in (ten) places, and the guileless Christian is told this is a better “translation.” But Hades is not a translation; it is a TRANSLITERATION. By the use of this transliteration, the word “HELL” has been all but taken out of the Bible, much to the delight of Christ-rejecting, self-righteous “Christians.” If the revisers had been honest men would they not have transliterated “Heaven” as well and called it “Ouranos” instead of “Heaven?” Again, if they wanted to put the Bible “in the language of 20<sup>th</sup> century people,” why did they not invent a NEW word for “hades”? HADES IS NOT AN ENGLISH WORD.””*

It is noteworthy that the NWT agrees with the NIV, NASV in every passage that these two versions use the term *“Hades.”* (The NWT consistently transliterates *Gehenna* and *Hades*.)

Therefore, however Watchtower utilized the AV1611 reading of **“hell”** it nevertheless agreed closely with the modern versions with respect to its text – against the AV1611.

White appears once again to be commenting obliquely on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work<sup>14 p 290ff</sup>, this time with respect to her Chapter 18, *Judgement or Internment?* Listing the passages that White does not, where the NIV, NASV substitute *“death,” “grave,” “sheol,” “the depths”* and *“hades”* for **“hell,”** she states.

*“Hell’s presentation in the bible can hardly be extinguished, but recent versions have diluted it by submerging the reader in a welter of words, substituting ‘death’, ‘grave’, ‘sheol’, ‘hades’ and ‘the depths’ for the word, ‘hell’. Using five additional ambiguous words fractures the impact. The shatterment flies in the face of clarity, obscuring God’s warning. Descending progressively downward from “death” to the “grave,” then to “sheol” or “hades,” then “the depths,” and finally to “hell,” the NIV offers a station, waiting to prove the afterlife theory of every philosophy and cult afloat...*

*“Agnostics, atheists, humanists, Jehovah’s Witnesses and a variety of cults believe eternal death, not hell, lies beyond the last breath. Again, Blavatsky dictates and the NIV and its editors comply – replacing the word ‘hell’ with ‘death’.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger illustrates with both Cultist, i.e. Luciferian, Armstrongism, Jehovah’s Witnesses and NIV Editorial quotes, equating *“death”* and *“hell.”* She continues with respect to the NIV’s repeated substitution of *“grave”* for **“hell,”** comparing the NWT Appendix note, her emphases *“[Hell] applies to the common grave of all mankind...”* with the statement of R. Laird Harris of the NIV Committee, *““The terms [hell and grave] are synonymous.””*

Citing Laird Harris again, with respect to *“Hell or Hades and Sheol,”* she states.

*““A number of modern versions simply do not translate the word...They...leave each reader to decide for himself...”*

*“Consequently the NASB joins the Jehovah’s Witness New World Bible and leaves the Hebrew sheol untranslated. The NIV joins them both in not translating the Greek hades...*

*“Thanks to the new bible versions, New Age chieftains like Lola Davis can now say: “We now know that there is no ‘down there’ where there is a tangible hell.” New Agers cling to the ‘new version’ of hades as a second chance. “...the soul in Hades, having awakened to its unfortunate state, desires a change, it can attain such a change through reincarnation.”*

*“New Agers join ranks with the NIV, NASB and Jehovah’s Witnesses in replacing the ‘torments of hell’ with, as Blavatsky called them, the “seven mansions of Hades.” She defines the ‘new version’ of hell as follows:*

*““Hades was quite a different place from our region of eternal damnation and might be termed rather an intermediate state of purification.”*

*“When new versions do not translate hades, because they want to “leave each reader to decide for themselves” what is meant, they give consent to the fraudulent fables of the New Age...”*

And to the Catholic heresy of purgatory.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger states, *“‘New’ Greek editor F. J. A. Hort called purgatory, “a great and important truth.” His American counterpart Philip Schaff believed in an “extension of the period of grace for non Christians beyond the limits of the grave.” NIV editors believe men merely lie in the grave.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger cites Hort, Origen, Schaff and Westcott, all bible revisers whose efforts are germane to the propagation of modern versions, as believing that hell as a place or everlasting fire was merely *“figurative”* although, as Dr Mrs Riplinger emphasises, the Lord Jesus Christ described hell in the words of the rich man as *“this place of torment”* Luke 16:28b.

The pre-350 AD Gothic Bible has *“hell”* in Luke 16:23. See *Appendix, Table A16*.

James White does not see fit to challenge any of the material from *New Age Versions*, though he must have read it. The reader is left wondering why he did not do so.

With reference to White’s recommendation that *“The word sheol in the Hebrew is best translated by the Greek term hades”* Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 269-274</sup> rightly protests, his emphases, *“The NASV, NIV etc. refused to **translate** “Hades.” How is **no translation** an improvement over the AV translation?...”*

*“The modern versions do **not** translate “Hades” in Revelation 20:14, 6:8, or 1:8. “HADES”...is a **transliteration**...”*

With reference to White’s comments on Revelation 20:13, 14 – see above – Dr Ruckman responds\*, his emphases, *“**There is no “Biblical text” in Jimmy’s invented reading (“the realm of the dead”). That is “adding to the word of God and making “a fuller text by an expansion of Piety” [see White, p 43, 46, 153, 177]. Did it say “Death and the realm of the dead were cast into the lake of fire?” (Rev. 20:14). [White] said “Hell” was the lake of Fire. Why that is the J.W. position...Nobody in the Watchtower Society or the Kingdom Halls believes that **anyone** burns in “Hades”; with them, “Hades” is the grave. James White alters this to the “realm of the dead” but still gets rid of the **fire**...”***

\*Some of Dr Ruckman's comments have been transposed to preserve their respective threads because only part of his exposition on "**hell**" and "*hades*" is reproduced here.

Dr Ruckman asks, quite reasonably in this context.

*"What...was the Rich man in **Hell** (Luke 16) doing burning ("tormented in this flame") when he hadn't gone into the Lake of Fire yet?"*

Dr Ruckman then raises another inconsistency that White overlooked in his 'preference' for 'translating' "*sheol*" as "*hades*."

*"Jonah is said to be in **Hell** in the AV (Jonah 2), and yet the modern versions were afraid to translate the word (SHEOL). If Sheol is Hades (and so say **all** of the modern versions) why wasn't Jonah **burning**? **The rich man was. They were both in the same place!**"*

Dr Ruckman respond as follows to White's statement "groups that deny the existence of hell have utilized the KJV's rendering of passages that obviously are referring to the grave, not the lake of fire, as "hell" to obscure the Scripture's testimony to the reality of everlasting punishment."

First noting an 'inconsistency' in White's statement, Dr Ruckman writes, his emphases.

***"You just told every one of your readers that if a truth could be found SOMEWHERE in the Scripture it was perfectly alright to delete it ANOTHER place in the Scripture"***<sup>3 p 39-40, 46-7, 158-9</sup>. *Now you are telling your readers that the AV doesn't give a clear-cut picture of eternal punishment: i.e., it is guilty of "OBSCURING" it..."*

That is, White objects to "**hell**" in Revelation 20:13, 14 but he is being 'inconsistent' because the AV1611 has "**hell**" in all the *geena* verses and in 2 Peter 2:4, the *tartaroo* verse, see above, where the modern versions, NIV, NASV, also have "**hell**." Dr Ruckman continues.

*"Everlasting punishment is all over the AV...Daniel 12:22, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 9, Matthew 25:41, Revelation 14:10, 22:15 etc.*

*"White had to violate a sacred canon of Alexandria. He had excused the omission of "**firstborn**" (Matthew 1:25) **on the grounds that it showed up somewhere else** (Luke 2:7): he excused the omission of "**ME**" (John 6:47) **on the grounds that you could find it in John 6:35, 40**; and he excused the omission of "Christ" on seventeen occasions because you could find "Christ" **somewhere else**. Now he is telling you that **his versions have the liberty and freedom to practise that but the AV does not...TWO SEPARATE STANDARDS FOR JUDGING, AFTER TELLING YOU THAT YOUR BIBLE MUST BE JUDGED BY THE STANDARDS USED FOR ALL BIBLES.**"*

See White's comparison<sup>3 p 38</sup> of Ephesians 1:2 and Colossians 1:2, **White's Introduction**. See also White<sup>3 p 95, 128, 159, 170-2, 194-6</sup> and Cloud's remarks<sup>6 Part 3</sup>.

Dr Ruckman then counters White's attempts to justify the NASV, NIV reading, his emphases.

*"You are to believe that the failure of the NASV and NIV to translate "Hades" in Matthew 11:23, Luke 10:15, 16:23 and Acts 2:27, 31 helps you to believe in the "eternal punishment" of the lost which the AV "obscured" by writing down "**HELL**." The NASV didn't translate "SHEOL": they **transliterated** it and then **pretended** that an untranslated Greek word in the English New Testament was a **clearer** translation. But that isn't [all].*

*"White says...that the rich man's "spirit" (Luke 16) was in hell: the place of "departed SPIRITS."*

“The “spirit”...returns to “**God who gave it**” (Ecclesiastes 12:7), and the man’s SOUL departs from the body (Genesis 35:18, 2 Timothy 4:6) and winds up in the third heaven or HELL. (In the Old Testament it was Hell or Abraham’s bosom.) A man’s “spirit”...**doesn’t have EYES, or a TONGUE** (Luke 16:24) and **it can’t wear a ROBE** (Revelation 6:11). A “soul”...has a **BODILY SHAPE** (2 Corinthians 12:2, 1 Corinthians 15:44)...

“In regards to the AV being “guilty” of misleading people. Let me tell you a funny joke. I have drawn a chalk talk on “Where Do the Dead Go?”...through a period of forty-six years...My drawing on it has: Abraham’s bosom [paradise], Hades [hell], Sheol [hell], Mnemeion [the grave], Keber [the grave], Ouranos [heaven], Shamayim [heaven], Pscyhe [the soul], Soma [the body], Basar [the flesh, body], Nepesh [the soul], Ruach [the spirit], and Pneuma [the spirit] in it. **I have never had to alter ONE word in ANY edition of a King James Bible, in forty-six years of preaching that message to get across the doctrine of conscious eternal punishment in fire** (White left that out. He said “**everlasting punishment**” only), **I did not have to refer, ONE time, to any “modern translation.”**”

As Dr Ruckman indicates, much of this material is available in Clarence Larkin’s *Dispensational Truth*, p 95ff, published in 1920.

The pre-350 AD Gothic Bible and the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible support the AV1611’s consistent use of “**hell.**” See *Appendix, Table A16*.

Continuing his attack<sup>3 p 138, 147</sup> on Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 40-55</sup>, who addresses the same subject, White now objects to the AV1611’s use of “**Lucifer**” in Isaiah 14:12, where the NASV has “*O star of the morning*” and the NIV has “*O morning star*” essentially in agreement with the JB and NWT in removing the name “**Lucifer.**” See *Appendix, Table A1*.

White maintains that the modern readings are “*proper*” and “*perfectly acceptable translations of the Hebrew word*” *helel* “*according to the standard lexicon in the field, Brown, Driver, and Briggs.*” He states that “*The term “Lucifer”...came into biblical tradition through the translation of Jerome’s Vulgate*” and because “*Jerome’s translation is certainly not inerrant,*” bible believers are supposedly ‘strikingly inconsistent’ once again if they accuse the modern translators of “*removing “Lucifer” from the Bible*” and “*hiding Lucifer’s name,*” insofar as “*the very translations being accused...refer to Satan, the accuser, the “old serpent,” the devil, each and every time the terms appear in Scripture.*”

White should take into consideration Dr Mrs Riplinger’s researches<sup>14</sup> into lexicons. See her remarks in *Chapters 4, 5*. He alludes to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments on Isaiah 14:12 but fails to address them. Instead, he embarks on another round of obfuscation, starting with three rhetorical questions, posed by a third party; “*Isn’t Jesus the ‘morning star’ at Revelation 22:16?*” to which White answers in the affirmative, “*Doesn’t translating Isaiah 14:12 with ‘morning star’ identify Jesus with Lucifer?*” and “*Aren’t the modern translations trying to connect Jesus with the devil?...As amazing as it sounds, this is the exact argument of Gail Riplinger, New Age Versions, p 40-55.*”

In answer to the last two questions, White insists that the modern readings do not associate the Lord Jesus Christ, “**the bright and morning star**” of Revelation 22:16, with Lucifer by accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of having “*not read things in context very well.*” “*The person under discussion in Isaiah 14,*” says White, “*is obviously under the wrath of God in that passage (note verse 15),*” which is “*hard to imagine*” with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ. White hasn’t read Isaiah 53:5, 10 recently.

***“But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed”***

***“Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand”***

White then poses a further five questions. *“Aren’t the terms being used Isaiah 14 sarcastic?...Didn’t this person claim lofty titles that were proven to be misapplied? Doesn’t the Scripture speak of his “pomp” (v. 11) and his inward boasting (v. 13)?...[Aren’t] the terms that are applied to him in verse 12...meant to be taunts rather than actual descriptions of his person?”*

*“Doesn’t this,”* asks White, his emphasis, *“differ dramatically from the personal description that Jesus applies to **himself** in Revelation 22?”*

White’s five questions above may briefly be answered as follows. In spite of Lucifer’s **“pomp”** and **“inward boasting,”** the terms used in verse 12 are not taunts. They are **“actual descriptions of his person”** and of God’s judgement on his iniquity. The following passage from Ezekiel is a description of Lucifer as he was and how he became what he is, **“that crooked serpent”** Isaiah 27:1. (Concerning this verse, the modern versions, contrary to White’s assertion above, do not **“refer to Satan...each and every time the terms appear in Scripture.”** The NIV has the weaker term **“coiling,”** the NASV, NKJV follow suit with **“twisted,”** agreeing with the JB, which has **“twisting.”** The DR, RV and NWT have **“crooked”** in agreement with the AV1611 but thereby accentuating once again the steady departure of modern ‘evangelical’ bibles from **“the form of sound words”** 2 Timothy 1:13 of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible. Satan is above all, **“crooked.”**)

***“Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee. By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee”*** Ezekiel 28:15-17.

And Satan, or Lucifer *does* weaken the nations, Isaiah 14:12.

***“For he saith, By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom; for I am prudent: and I have removed the bounds of the people, and have robbed their treasures, and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man”*** Isaiah 10:13.

By contrast, God has established the nations.

***“When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel”*** Deuteronomy 32:8.

***“And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation”*** Acts 17:26.

Satan weakens nations by removing **“the bounds of their habitation”** in order to create the one-world kingdom of the Beast, who is an integrated man, Revelation 13, pictured as

a leopard, embodying the essential features of all three major racial groupings; white, yellow-brown and black. (See Dr Ruckman's treatise on this subject, entitled *Mark of the Beast*.)

"The personal description that Jesus applies to **himself** in Revelation 22" is a separate issue from that of Isaiah 14:12, where the context is "**the grave**," verse 11, "**hell**" (not "*sheol*") verses 9, 15 and "**the sides of the pit**" verse 15. The modern versions are attempting to force Isaiah 14:12 into the context of Isaiah 53:8 and to exacerbate the Lord's humiliation in order to detract from the revealed will of God in which the Lord Jesus Christ is "**an offering for sin**" Isaiah 53:10.

**"He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken"** Isaiah 53:8.

Loading Isaiah 14:12 into Isaiah 53:8 weakens the emphasis of the last clause.

The "*lofty titles*" that Satan claims are not misapplied. See the passage from Ezekiel 28. He had "**beauty**" and "**brightness**" and "**wast upon the holy mountain of God**" and he has a "**seat**" or "**throne**" by which the Beast will reign, Revelation 2:13, 13:2 see below for more details.

Instead of attacking a genuine student of "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21, like Dr Mrs Riplinger, White would do better to "**search the scriptures**" himself, John 5:39, "**comparing spiritual things with spiritual**" 1 Corinthians 2:13b.

White's protestations notwithstanding, the modern versions *do* remove "**Lucifer**" from the bible, with the exception of the NKJV. The substitution of "*star of the morning*" or "*morning star*" does not convey the significance of "**Lucifer**" because the term<sup>120 p 69</sup> is "*Lux-fero*" or "*light bearer*," therefore showing how "**Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light**" 2 Corinthians 11:14, or *appearance of light*<sup>121 p 18</sup>. White may scorn such disclosures but only the AV1611 has "**the God of forces**" in Daniel 11:38, whereas the NIV, NKJV, NASV have "*a god of fortresses*" the RV, JB, NWT "*the god of fortresses*" and the DR reading allows for either "*the god of forces or strongholds.*" The Lord said, "**I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven**" Luke 10:18 (6+6+6) and Revelation 13:13(!) reveals how "**another beast**" verse 11 "**maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men.**" Although other versions have these references with little change from the AV1611, only the AV1611 enables the reader to associate the "*light bearer*" with "**the God of forces**" or the highest form of energy, namely electricity, itself a "*light bearer*" with Satan as its "**God**" in his association with lightning and "**fire come down from heaven.**"

The significance of this association is that the world has never been more dependent on electricity than it is now.

And it has never been closer to Satan "**the prince of this world**" and "**the god of this world**" than it is now, Luke 4:6, John 12:31, 2 Corinthians 4:4.

And the world therefore effectively worships Satan through its obsession with electricity. Note Revelation 13:3, 4 "**all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast**" e.g. by means today of massive rock concerts<sup>120 p 69</sup>, Daniel 3:1-11, energized by the light-bearing "**God of forces**," electricity – and the Devil, "**which gave power unto the beast**," both political and electrical, it appears.

It follows that in these “*last days*” of “*perilous times*” 2 Timothy 3:1, “*the whole world lieth in wickedness*” 1 John 5:19b because it lieth in electricity, Lucifer’s “*God of forces*” of which he himself is “*God,*” accentuating “*the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life*” 1 John 2:15, 16 and in turn the world “*abideth not in the doctrine of Christ*” 2 John 9.

It is true that “*the whole world lieth in wickedness*” even when John wrote his letter. The Lord Jesus said of the world of the First Advent, “*the works thereof are evil*” John 7:7 and Paul made reference to “*this present evil world*” Galatians 1:4, not “*age.*” Throughout history, Satan “*the prince of this world*” has ensured that “*the wickedness of man was great in the earth*” Genesis 6:5, for example in Noah’s time in which “*all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth*” by means of “*the angels that sinned*” of whom “*God cast them down to hell, and delivered them to chains of darkness*” Genesis 6:2, 12, Peter 2:4, Jude 6. But now, in a time when “*as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man*” Luke 17:26, Satan will ensure that “*iniquity shall abound*” Matthew 24:12, with the help of the light-bearing “*God of forces,*” electricity, to establish the global reign of the Beast, Revelation 13.

Dr Ruckman rightly observes<sup>122 p 124</sup>, his emphases, “*The electro-magnetic waves of ninety-three TV channels, twenty FM stations, forty AM stations, and more than 2,000 shortwave stations are in your room (or car) right NOW and are going through your body. That is not a religious faith; that is a scientific fact that can be proved by turning on a portable radio or a portable TV set that is not even “plugged in” to anything. The crocodiles, serpents, snakes, naked women, fiery deaths, bloody, headless corpses, floods, monsters, and robots are right in your room. And you do not have the “D.T.s.”*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 44</sup> describes the sinister spiritual undertones of this unceasing electro-magnetic radiation aimed at seducing a sinful world population into accepting a false Messiah, “*Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders*” 2 Thessalonians 2:9, aided and abetted by “*the God of forces.*”

“*Today the “prince of the power of the air” propagandises to a new generation through the radio air waves that “a new god...is a star from the east...another second coming.”*”

Only the AV1611’s readings of “*Lucifer*” and “*the God of forces*” make this clear. The new versions, by dropping one or both terms – and the deletion of “*the God of forces*” from Daniel 11:38 is progressive, with the so-called evangelical versions, NIV, NKJV, NASV worse offenders than even the Catholic or Watchtower versions – ‘break the circuit’ and the revelation is lost.

But this is above and beyond White’s thesis. However, he should at least have allowed Dr Mrs Riplinger to present her findings, summarised elsewhere<sup>8 p 316</sup>.

“*Twentieth century versions have removed the name Lucifer, thereby eliminating the ONLY reference to him in the entire bible...The Hebrew is “helel, ben shachar,” which is accurately translated, “Lucifer, son of the morning.” The NIV...give(s) an English translation AS IF the Hebrew said, “shachar kokab, ben shachar” or “morning star, son of the morning (or dawn)”. Yet the word for star (kobab) appears nowhere in the text. Also ‘morning’ appears only once, as the KJV shows, not twice as new versions indicate...*”

“*The ultimate blasphemy occurs when the “morning star” takes “Lucifer’s” place in Isaiah 14. Jesus Christ is the “morning star” and is identified as such in Revelation 22:16, 2:28 and 2 Peter 1:19 [using the term “day star”]. With this slight of hand switch,*



*Satan not only slyly slips out of the picture but lives up to his name “the accuser” (Revelation 12:10) by attempting to make Jesus Christ the subject of the diatribe in Isaiah 14.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that, “*the word kokab is translated as ‘star’ dozens of other times by NIV translators...New version editors know boger kokabis ‘morning star’ since it is used in Job 38:7. If God had intended to communicate ‘morning star’, he could have repeated it here. The word he chose, helel, appears nowhere else in the Old Testament, just as “Lucifer” appears nowhere else.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 40-1</sup> explains Lucifer’s obsession with his prime objective; “**I will be like the most High**” Isaiah 14:14.

*“The anointed cherub wanted an identity change. The new persona he wished to pursue included the response of worship from whomsoever would. This is seen in his appeal to Jesus Christ to “bow down and worship me,” recorded in Luke 4:7. Unfortunately his ambition will be fulfilled, as seen in Revelation 13:4, “and they worshipped the dragon.” Revelation 12:9 identifies, “the great dragon [as]...that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan.”*

*“The public relations campaign to transform the public’s image of Satan, from his true evil character to one which would inspire worship, is monumental. It pivots upon the transformation of his identity.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 43-53</sup> describes the Devil’s “*public relations campaign*” in some detail. Part of his strategy is to discredit the Lord Jesus Christ, by substitution of “*morning star*” for “**Lucifer**” in Isaiah 14:12 – see above – so Satan can supplant Him and receive worship rightfully due only to Him of Whom Revelation 5:12 states “**Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.**” Such a passage must always be an affront to the evil one.

Dr Mrs Riplinger therefore states, citing a 1913 commentary, “*“The title daystar is truly Christ’s [from 2 Peter 1:19] but will be confiscated by the antichrist...And Satan will assume it, who is the spirit that energizes the heathen world power Babylon, that now energizes the apostate church and shall at last energize the secular antichrist...and his champion the false prophet.”*”

Although he appealed to lexicons for the translation of *helel*, it is strange that White failed to make an issue of the marginal alternative for “*Lucifer*” of “*day star,*” equivalent to “*morning star*” and found in both contemporary and 1611 AV1611 editions. It should be recalled that White<sup>3 p 77-8</sup> had earlier resorted to marginal notes in an effort to subvert the AV1611 Text. See **Chapter 4**.

White’s reluctance to engage Dr Mrs Riplinger on this point and his subsequent decision to retreat into a lexicon may stem from what he must have read in *New Age Versions* on the term “*day star.*” See above and also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s explanation under the heading “*Why “Morning Star”?*”

*“The matching of Lucifer with the morning star rises not from the Hebrew bible but from classical mythology, a fount of bitter water not intended by God as our “fountain of living waters” (Jeremiah 17:13). Reference works concede that the switch is based on “classical mythology for the planet Venus”...”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s researches into lexicons<sup>114</sup> – see above – would explain why the term “*morning star*” found its way into the one that White consulted.

Dr Ruckman observes<sup>121 p 32</sup> “Study Isaiah 14:12 in relation to the word “Lucifer” from the Latin, “LUX FERRO”: “light bearers,” or “shining ones.” The RV, quaintly enough, gives Satan the title reserved for Jesus Christ in this passage, and says “Day-star” for Lucifer.”

Perhaps the King James translators placed “day star” in the margin as a warning to future generations of readers that such a perverse transfer could take place, which it now has. Dr Ruckman<sup>123 p 38, 56</sup> has warned, his emphasis, that, “Satan is “**anointed**” as a “christ” (Ezekiel 28:14; Matthew 24:5)...[and is] **the greatest imitator of Jesus Christ.**” The Devil is well placed for an attempted coup to usurp the Lord’s title. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citation above.

The King’s men were clearly shrewd enough to discern when Jerome and other church fathers<sup>14 p 47, 49, 25 p 77</sup> could usefully be followed even though they knew “*the Latin Vulgate...was suspect because it was popish.*” White’s innuendo against them, “*Jerome’s translation is certainly not inerrant*” therefore contains nothing of substance.

Like the rest of his comments on “**Lucifer**” and “*the morning star.*”

As an additional note on Isaiah 14:12, Dr Gerardus Bouw has a detailed discussion of the term “**Lucifer**” in his book, *The Book of Bible Problems*, p 210ff and reveals that the word is found in the Old Latin Bible of 150 AD. It did not originate with Jerome, as White mistakenly believes.

White now focuses on 1 Timothy 6:10. See **Appendix, Table A1**. The NASV – along with the NKJV - reads essentially with the NIV, with “*a root of all sorts of evil*” versus “**the root of all evil.**”

White asks, his emphases, “*First, is the love of money **the** root of evil, or **a** root of evil? Secondly, is it a root of **all** evil, or of **all kinds** of evil?*” He maintains that, “*The word for “root” in the Greek does not have the article before it, hence the more literal translation...would be “a root,” not the definite **the** root. The text is not saying that the love of money is the **only** origin or source of evil, but that it is **one** of great importance...Literally the Greek reads “of all the evils,” the terms being plural...The KJV translation is a possibility grammatically speaking, but it seems to miss Paul’s point. The love of money gives rise to **all sorts** of evil things, but there are, obviously, evils in the world that have nothing to do with the love of money...it is difficult to see how rape, for example, can be blamed on “the love of money.”*”

White<sup>3 p 139-140</sup> takes Dr Grady<sup>98 p 283-5</sup> to task because he “*focuses upon this passage to accuse any and all modern version publishers of only seeking to make a profit.*”

White neglected to include the citation by Dr Grady of the independent witness, his emphases, whose report entirely justifies Dr Grady’s reference to the NKJV reading for 1 Timothy 6:10.

“*A Newsweek article about [Thomas Nelson Publisher’s] president, Sam Moore, entitled “He Reaps What He sows” was “right on the money.” “The business is blessed by its recession-proof nature. Unlike other products, the Good Book sells particularly well in tough economic times. And Nelson, which distributes its Bibles largely through Christian bookstores, has left no stone unturned. **The company publishes seven of the nine major translations of the Bible** and presents them in 650 different styles...It’s all in keeping, [Moore] says, with his mission to “honour God, serve humanity – and enhance shareholder value.” As Wall Street might say, Amen.*”

This author has summarised the motives of the modern translators elsewhere<sup>8 p 196-7</sup>, including comments with respect to inclusion of the definite article for “*the root*” and in other passages of scripture where it is not in ‘the Greek’ but should be in ‘the English’ for accurate translation, in order not “to miss Paul’s point” or that of any other biblical writer.

(It never seems to occur to bible critics like James White that matters such as the absence (or presence) of articles in “*the Greek*” and “*the more literal translation*” versus a more precise though idiomatic translation would have been elementary to scholars of the calibre of the King’s men. For that reason, his comments often seem to reflect what Burgon<sup>8 p 174</sup> termed “*the schoolboy method of translation.*” See remarks in **Chapter 5.**)

“Our critic’s next “wrong inclusion” is in 1 Timothy 6:10, where “*the root of all evil*”, AV1611, should be “*a root of all kinds of evil*” as in the NIV, NWT, Ne and the renderings of the other Greek texts. The JB has “*the root of all evils*”.

“The modern alteration is not surprising because like all modern versions, the NIV is bound by Copyright. Gail Riplinger states (12) p 171-172 “At the root of all the rhetoric about the need for new versions lies the true cause - covetousness...The KJV is the only version not bound by a copyright. No author or publisher receives a royalty because God is the author. However, “God is not the author of confusion” (1 Corinthians 14:33) or of “commercial ventures.” The latter term was used to describe the ASV (NASB, Living Bible), RV (RSV) and ‘New’ Greek Text by Philip Schaff the chairman of their American Committee...

““The autobiography of J. B. Phillips (NASB Interlinear Greek-English New Testament Forward, J. B. Phillips Translation, Living Letters et al) likewise lays bare his beliefs (about his billfold). He not only expects to receive royalties from the sale of these versions but those who use “extended quotes”...must expect to pay a proper copyright fee.”

““Is it any wonder new version editors twist or water down verses which warn of seeking wealth?” 1 Timothy 6:10 is just such a verse.

“Pastor Rockwood of Halifax, N.S., Canada cited The Wall Street Journal, Nov. 16<sup>th</sup>, 1978 in his review of the NIV: “Zondervan Corp. believes it has struck a new vein of gold in an ancient and well-mined lode: the Bible. Accordingly, it told analysts here, it raised its already-gleaming sales and earnings forecasts...Zondervan raised its earnings prediction 10 cents a share, to \$1.85, and its sales prediction \$3 million to \$41 million, for the year.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 4</sup> has this comment on White’s notion of crimes that supposedly “that have nothing to do with the love of money.” Her observations reflect a much more realistic worldview than that of James White.

She also has an incisive answer to White’s supposition of what should be derived from “*the Greek.*”

“Speed reading 1 Tim. 6:10 brings White to his dead end conclusion. “[I]s the love of money the root cause of rape?” [White misreads] the word ‘ROOT’ (R-O-O-T) as the word ‘cause’ (C-A-U-S-E)...A root is not a ‘seed.’ A seed generates or ‘causes’ something; a root merely acts as a vehicle for feeding. The pornography, movie, fashion and advertising industry and their “love of money” are at the root. This root “leads into temptation” man’s sinful nature. This nature is ready and willing to bear evil fruit; the desire for gain inspires (or is at the root of) the tempters.

*“Also the new versions’ addition of the word “kinds of” does not occur in any Greek text. “Evil” is plural, disallowing their interpolation and implying all.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>16p 131</sup> has these comments on 1 Timothy 6:10, his emphases.

*“1. Every piece of communist literature on both sides of the Atlantic can be traced to **that** root...the Bilderbergers, the international bankers, the Illuminati, the House of Rothschild, and the whole BANKING system – with all financial wars, financial crime (the Mafia, the Cosa Nostra, etc.), all financial communist cells, and all financial revolutions – were MONEY-MAKING jobs. **THE LOVE OF MONEY IS THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL, and never has been only A ROOT OF ALL KINDS OF EVIL ...***

*“2. Is there **unemployment** in your area? Do teenagers roam the streets because they have nothing to do? Are there **riots and demonstrations** because white people won’t hire black people?...Behind the unemployment lies FDR, the “New Deal,” President Wilson, the Federal Reserve Bank, Carter, Kennedy, and Eisenhower with the Federal takeover. Martin Luther King Jr. was PAID to stir up a following to burn \$40,000,000 worth of property. He paid more income taxes in a year than most of you do in FIVE...*

*“3. Are the Jehovah’s Witnesses rampant in your area? Do you have trouble with Mormons and Catholics? Are the Christian bookstores in your area flooded with various perversions of the Bible that back these cults up in their false doctrines? Well, where do phoney “Bibles” come from? They are **published** are they not? **Are they not published to SELL?**... **“THE ARTICLE IS NOT IN THE GREEK TEXT OF 1 TIMOTHY 6:10”?** Do you suppose anyone who has seen every reviser and every translator in the world **INSERT ARTICLES** where they are not “in the Greek text” through a period of 100 years, thinks YOU are sane or honest? Why is America flooded with trash called “reliable versions” (NASV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, NEB, NWT, TLB) which divide the body of Christ into fragments? Easy: **it’s a paying operation.** Sin pays. It pays in hard, cold **cash**...*

*“4. Do you find 600,000,000 Mariolaters in Ireland, Italy, Spain, Canada, Mexico, and South America?...Statues of “Mary” **SELL.** Beads sell. Go to Lourdes, Guadeloupe, and Fatima, and see if they do. Who was it that taught these people they had to believe such blasphemy to be “apostolic Christians”? Easy: some people that wanted their support and their income. The Vatican Billions (Avro Manhattan) lists and documents the income of the Vatican State. It is the richest corporation on the face of this earth, and no American or British “Imperialist” could touch it when it came to **FINANCIAL RAPE** of foreign populations. The Dark Age “Peter’s Pence” that built cathedrals was a money operation: so was the selling of indulgences and the purchase of church offices (simony).*

*“5. ...Why does Bob Jones III want to be “identified” with a Book he doesn’t **believe** is the word of God? Easy: to get **more students**, and to sucker parents who will trust him and send their kids to his school. **“FOR THE LOVE OF MONEY IS THE ROOT [NEVER, NEVER “A” ROOT] OF ALL EVIL...”***

*“6. There are active, in America, three major TV networks whose only occupation 365 days a year [is] to create dissatisfaction and covetousness (Luke 16:14-15) in the hearts and minds of the people who watch them. Make no mistake about it; any man or woman who watches TV more than sixty minutes a day is getting brainwashed into **WANTING** things that cost **money** that he or she does not have. Whether this be a good-looking belly dancer, a prostitute, a new car, a fur coat, a new set of tools, a trip to Hawaii, a case of beer, some good-looking boy friends, an insurance policy, “more jobs,” or “more government handouts”: it is one ceaseless barrage from sunrise to midnight to the effect that*

*you NEED WHAT YOU DO NOT HAVE...Television is the resurrected ghost of Karl Marx sitting in your living room... ”*

With respect to the absence of the definite article in “*the Greek*” in 1 Timothy 6:10, Dr Ruckman cites 1 Corinthians 2:16, where the scholars inserted a definite article, Hebrews 2:9, where the scholars inserted *two* definite articles and Luke 1:17, with *four* definite articles inserted, all of which “*are found in no copies of Greek manuscripts from any set of manuscripts found in any “family” of manuscripts.*”

1 Timothy 6:10 does not differ grammatically from the above cases. Dr Ruckman concludes, his emphasis, “*5000 Bible perverters were brought under conviction by the **King James** text, and set about to get rid of it for personal reasons.*”

5001, including James White.

White’s next target<sup>3 p 140-1</sup> is the AV1611 reading for 2 Timothy 2:15 versus that of the NIV and NASV. See **Appendix, Table A1**. The NKJV also substitutes “*be diligent*” for “*study*.”

White declares that, “*The NASB’s “be diligent” is right on the mark. The NIV’s “do your best” seems to miss some of the force of the term, and the KJV’s “study” limits the meaning of the word far too much for the modern reader who might not understand “study” to refer to a concerted effort at diligence and effort...in [Timothy’s] ministry. This attitude may well include the aspect of study, but in no way is Paul’s admonishment to be limited solely to that activity.*”

Not even when the verse concludes with the phrase “***rightly dividing the word of truth***”?

White neglects to explain that the verse is the one and only command in the scriptures to “*study*” the scriptures. The modern translations<sup>8 p 86</sup> eliminate this command. The RV, NASV, NIV, NKJV, JB, NWT also weaken the related command in John 5:39 by altering “***Search the scriptures***” to a mere observation, “*You search the scriptures,*” though the NIV inserts “*study*” in this verse, having changed it in 2 Timothy 2:15. (The DR follows the AV1611 readings.)

The modern translators appear reluctant to encourage their readers to study their ‘bibles.’ Are they afraid that too many questions will arise, after comparison is made with the Text of the AV1611?

White believes that the AV1611’s “***quick and powerful***” in Hebrews 4:12 is inferior to the NASV and NIV’s “*living and active*” because, his emphasis, ““*Quick*” ***never*** means “*fast*” when used by the KJV... “*quick*” refers to “*living*” or “*alive*” in the AV...*The second term, rendered “powerful” here by the AV (but rendered “effectual” at 1 Corinthians 16:9 and Philemon 1:6) refers to something that is active and effectual in its task...Any honest person must admit that the modern translations provide a much needed element of clarity and precision that is lacking in the AV.*”

Thus far, all of White’s work has been shown to lack “*clarity and precision*” and much of it lacks honesty – another biblical term that White scurrilously attacks in spite of his earlier pledge<sup>3 p 13</sup> to “*truth and honesty.*” His rejection of the AV1611 reading “***quick and powerful***” is no exception.

Dr Vance<sup>124 p 278</sup> explains how the meaning of “***quick***” developed from its original to its current usage.

*“The original meaning [of “quick”] was “characterized by the presence of life,” and it is from this sense that developed the meaning of fast or prompt. The latter usage is not found in the AV.”*

It is possible, though, that a similar usage is found.

Dr Ruckman<sup>125 p 83-4</sup> states, his emphasis. *“The word “quick” is the one used in such terms as “the quick and the dead” (1 Peter 4:5)...The word “quicken” is defined for us in the AV in Ephesians 2:1-5. It obviously means to give life to something. If a thing is “quicken,” it is alive; however, I wouldn’t argue about the term. You see, when I was born again, time speeded up for me; the pace tripled...Now a year goes by so fast I don’t know what happens to it: it’s “quicken” as far as I’m concerned.”*

The meaning of “quick” as “alive” in the AV1611 is defined in Numbers 16:30, 33 so White’s insistence on use of the modern term in Hebrews 4:12 is unnecessary.

***“But if the LORD make a new thing, and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them up, with all that appertain unto them, and they go down quick into the pit; then ye shall understand that these men have provoked the LORD.”***

***“They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them: and they perished from among the congregation.”***

Moreover, the same chapter uses the word “living” in a context where it is clearly appropriate for the sense of the narrative. (The word “living” occurs repeatedly in the AV1611, in both Testaments, again, obviously where it fits the context, especially with respect to the term “the living God,” e.g. 1 Timothy 6:17, found in both Testaments and occurring a total of 30 times.)

***“And he stood between the dead and the living; and the plague was stayed”*** Numbers 16:48.

Furthermore, 1 Peter 1:23 refers to *“the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.”*

So the AV1611 leaves the reader in no doubt about the ‘living’ nature of the *“the word of God.”*

And Young<sup>71</sup> indicates that the King James translators rendered *zao* as both “living” and “quick” and selected the former much more often, on 37 occasions versus 4, these being in Hebrews 4:12 and in the expressions “quick and dead” and “the quick and the dead” Acts 10:42, 2 Timothy 4:1, 1 Peter 4:5.

So why didn’t the King James translators choose “living” in Hebrews 4:12?

That said, Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 1142</sup> observes *“Speed and hastiness often accompany ‘q’: “quickly” is defined as “hastened” in Gen. 18:6.”*

***“And Abraham hastened into the tent unto Sarah, and said, Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth.”***

“Quick” is an adjective in Hebrews 4:12 and “quickly” is an adverb but the two terms must be related. “Quickly” occurs 39 times in the AV1611 and always connotes “speed and hastiness,” as Rahab said to the messengers of the king of Jericho about the two spies, *“pursue after them quickly; for ye shall overtake them”* Joshua 2:5b and as the angel said to the women in Matthew 28:7, *“go quickly and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead.”*

The word “quick” must therefore denote both life *and* vigour, where it occurs in the AV1611, especially to emphasise the contrast with “the dead” who lack *both*. This is in

keeping with the distinct picture of a *sword* thrust in Hebrews 4:12, because in addition to the depiction of “*seed...incorruptible*” in 1 Peter 1:23, Ephesians 6:17 states “*the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.*”

Again, White forgot to consider the *whole* verse.

***“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”***

The term “*living*” is exact for the expression “*the living God*” in reference to “*the King of kings, and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality*” 1 Timothy 6:15, 16 but “*quick*” is exact to denote the vigor of the sword thrust.

Again, the AV1611 is superior to the NASV, NIV, James White’s opinion notwithstanding.

The AV1611 term “*powerful*” is also superior to the modern term “*active.*” This term does not appear in the AV1611, perhaps because it implies movement without purpose or direction. It is also much weaker than “*powerful*” which *is* an energetic term in the AV1611, in spite of White’s opinion to the contrary, as the piercing sword thrust in Hebrews 4:12 emphasizes.

Consider Psalm 29:4, 5.

***“The voice of the LORD is powerful; the voice of the LORD is full of majesty. The voice of the LORD breaketh the cedars; yea, the LORD breaketh the cedars of Lebanon.”***

“*Powerful,*” i.e. full of power and energy, not merely “*active,*” is clearly the right word for the context. If “*the voice of the LORD is powerful*” it follows immediately that “*the word of God is...powerful.*”

“*Effectual*” is correct in the 6 verses where the AV1611 uses it, as inspection of the contexts reveals; 1 Corinthians 16:9, 2 Corinthians 1:6, Ephesians 3:7, 4:16, Philemon 6, James 4:16. None of these contexts includes a sword thrust.

Dr Ruckman states<sup>125 p 84</sup>, most astutely, “*The Lord’s “sword” can reach the devil’s “bones” (Job 40:19) even though they are as “bars of iron”...The reason why the Lord Jesus Christ uses the scripture (“it is written”) every single time He answers Satan (see Luke 4:1-10) is because He knows that it is the word of GOD that PIERCES through that being. That is why Paul called it “THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT.”*”

As indicated, it is not the AV1611 that lacks “*clarity and precision*” but the opinions of James White, as usual.

White<sup>3 p 142</sup> now tries again to exalt the NASV over the AV1611, with respect to the word “*honest*” 2 Corinthians 8:21, Philippians 4:8, 1 Peter 2:12. See **Appendix, Table A1**. He prefers the terms “*honorable*” 2 Corinthians 8:21, Philippians 4:8 and “*excellent*” 1 Peter 2:12, as found in the NASV. He purports to inform the reader, his emphasis.

“*Another term that does not always mean what it did back in the days of James I of England is the word “honest”...*

“*In a number of instances the writer of Scripture is referring to that which is “honourable” and “excellent” not that which is “honest” as we use the word today. When we are exhorted to think on that which is “honourable” or “noble” as the NIV has it (Philippians 4:8), we are being called to consider higher things, not merely things that are honest*

*over against dishonest...for that which is noble and excellent will at the very least be honest, but there are many honest things that are hardly noble or excellent. Again we find the modern translations quite **honestly** surpassing the KJV in clarity and exactitude."*

Lacking entirely in illustration, White's comment is neither clear nor exact. What "*higher things*" is he referring to and is he aware of Paul's warning in 2 Timothy 3:4 about "*traitors, heady, highminded*"?

White has plainly forgotten Romans 12:16, with the expression "*provide things honest*" in the very next verse, which cross references to 2 Corinthians 8:21.

***"Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits."*** Romans 12:16.

White is clearly going against Paul's admonition.

White also overlooks Luke 8:15, where the word "*honest*" appears for the first time in the AV1611 in the expression "*honest and good heart*" and is contrasted with the phrase "*deceitfulness of riches*" in the parallel passages of Matthew 13:22 and Mark 4:19.

The "*honest and good heart*" of Luke 8:15 is further contrasted with Jeremiah 17:9.

***"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?"***

Clearly "*honest*" in the AV1611, wherever it occurs, means 'not deceitful,' or not lying, just as the word is used today, which explains why it is grouped with "*true*," "*just*" and "*pure*" in Philippians 4:8, all of which are aspects of honesty as the term applies today. White overlooked these associations as well.

Such association occurs in 2 Corinthians 13:7, 8, noting that Paul urged the Corinthians to "*be ye followers of me*" 1 Corinthians 4:16 "*even as I also am of Christ*" 1 Corinthians 11:1.

***"Now I pray to God that ye do no evil; not that we should appear approved, but that ye should do that which is honest, though we be as reprobates. For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."***

2 Corinthians 8:21 states "***Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men.***" The parallel passage in Romans 12:17 reads "***Provide things honest in the sight of all men.***"

White appears not to have read the context of 2 Corinthians 8, 9. It concerns "*the ministering to the saints*," 2 Corinthians 8:4 Halley<sup>116 p 577</sup> states with respect to Paul's journey to Jerusalem, Acts 21:1-16, that "*The purpose of the journey was to deliver the Offering of Money which he had gathered from Gentile Churches in Greece and Asia Minor for the poor saints in Jerusalem (Acts 24:17, Romans 15:25, 26, 1 Corinthians 16:1-4, 2 Corinthians 8:10, 9:1-11). It was a great offering. He had spent over a year gathering it.*"

Romans 15:25, 26 is explicit in this respect.

***"But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem."***

The immediate context of 2 Corinthians 8 is the collection and transfer of this "*Offering of Money*" and it is necessary for the Lord's people to "*provide things honest in the sight of all men*" with respect to openness, correctness and fair dealing in all financial matters.



***“Moreover they reckoned not with the men, into whose hand they delivered the money to be bestowed on workmen: for they dealt faithfully”*** 2 Kings 12:15.

***“They”*** refers to ***“the king’s scribe and the high priest”*** verse 10, who ***“put up in bags, and told the money,”*** like a modern ‘teller.’ They would therefore have ***“plentifully declared the thing as it is”*** Job 26:3b.

By extension, Paul’s admonition to his readers to ***“provide things honest in the sight of all men”*** with respect to openness, correctness and fair dealing, would apply to all aspects of Christian living, as 1 Peter 2:12 reveals.

***“Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evildoers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.”***

Note that while ***“conversation”*** does not mean ‘dialogue,’ it *does* refer to what can be seen and heard, as Peter explains, describing how God brought judgement on Sodom and Gomorrah.

***“And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: (For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds;)”*** 2 Peter 2:7, 8.

The term ***“honest”*** may assume the meanings that White ascribes to it in the verses that he cites but it never departs from its essential meaning of reference to ***“the thing as it is”*** and ***“the things that are right”*** Isaiah 45:19, where the Lord Himself is speaking.

***“I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth: I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain: I the LORD speak righteousness, I declare things that are right.”***

Moreover, the AV1611 directly associates biblical nobility with the *essential* quality of honesty, as the word is understood today, so the NIV change in Philippians 4:8 adds nothing to the sense of the AV1611.

***“These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so”*** Acts 17:11.

The term ***“honourable”*** is found on 30 occasions in the AV1611 and conveys uprightness and refinement as distinct from baseness of character.

***“The child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable”*** Isaiah 3:5b.

But contrary to White’s opinion, ‘honourable’ individuals are not always disposed to be wholly ‘honest,’ as either term is understood today and, no doubt, just as the King’s men understood them in their day.

***“And the young man deferred not to do the thing, because he had delight in Jacob’s daughter: and he was more honourable than all the house of his father”*** Genesis 34:19.

Hamor and Shechem his son, referred to in verse 19, had earlier said to the sons of Jacob, ***“And ye shall dwell with us: and the land shall be before you; dwell and trade ye therein, and get you possessions therein”*** Genesis 34:10.

But they were more interested acquiring the possessions of Jacob and his sons.

***“Shall not their cattle and their substance and every beast of theirs be ours? only let us consent unto them, and they will dwell with us”*** Genesis 34:23.

Of course, ***“the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father deceitfully”*** Genesis 34:13 and the Hivites reaped what they had sown, verse 25, 26, Galatians 6:7b, showing that although Shechem was ***“more honourable,”*** he was not altogether ***“honest.”***

So the term ***“honourable”*** is not a superior substitute for ***“honest.”*** Honourable men as national leaders can still be party to teaching error and condoning a lie and honourable men and women can still be party to believing and acting upon a lie in opposing the Gospel of Christ, i.e. they can be *dishonest*.

***“The ancient and honourable, he is the head; and the prophet that teacheth lies, he is the tail. For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed”*** Isaiah 9:15, 16.

***“But the Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts”*** Acts 13:50.

But where the term ***“honourable”*** refers to the Lord, it retains the association with honesty. The same should be true of the Lord’s New Testament saints and therefore the word ***“honest”*** in 2 Corinthians 8:21 and Philippians 4:8 covers what is ***“honourable.”***

***“His work is honourable and glorious: and his righteousness endureth for ever”*** Psalm 111:3.

***“The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness”*** Psalm 11:7, 8.

***“Excellent”*** is found in the AV1611 in 34 verses and is equivalent to ***“right things”*** and not lying, i.e. honesty, so the NASV change in 1 Peter 2:12 is unnecessary. See also comments above on 1 Peter 2:12.

***“Hear; for I will speak of excellent things; and the opening of my lips shall be right things”*** Proverbs 8:6.

***“Excellent speech becometh not a fool: much less do lying lips a prince”*** Proverbs 17:7.

So contrary to White’s opinion, it is actually the AV1611 that surpasses the modern translations ***“in clarity and exactitude.”***

White then presents a variety of alternative readings for the AV1611’s use of ***“angels”*** in Psalm 8:5, see ***Appendix, Table A1***, including ***“the heavenly beings”*** NIV and ***“God”*** NRSV, NASV. The NKJV has ***“angels.”*** White condones all the readings because ***“you can find the term elohim used in each of these ways somewhere in the Old Testament.”***

Young<sup>71</sup> indicates that the AV1611 Old Testament almost always translates *elohim* as ***“God”*** or ***“gods.”*** It translates *elohim* once as ***“angels”*** i.e. in Psalm 8:5, but never as ***“the heavenly beings.”***

In fact, the alternative readings are *not* appropriate to Psalm 8:5.

Man is not ***“a little lower than God.”*** He is a great deal lower than God.

***“In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return”*** Genesis 3:19.

*“Yea, the stars are not pure in his sight. How much less man, that is a worm? and the son of man, which is a worm?”* Job 25:5b, 6.

*“Nevertheless man being in honour abideth not: he is like the beasts that perish”* Psalm 49:20.

*“Thou turnest man to destruction; and sayest, Return, ye children of men”* Psalm 90:2.

*“The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away”* Psalm 90:10.

*“Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils: for wherein is he to be accounted of?”* Isaiah 2:22.

*“All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the LORD bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass”* Isaiah 40:6b, 7.

*“He shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen”* 1 Timothy 6:15, 16.

*“Whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away”* James 4:14.

By contrast,

*“Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.”* Psalm 90:2.

“Heavenly beings” is not a suitable alternative either. The term is vague and could refer to seraphims, Isaiah 6:2, cherubims, Genesis 3:24, Ezekiel 10:1, principalities and powers, Ephesians 6:12, besides angels, who are defined as “gods” in Genesis 3:5. The NASV, NIV, NRSV, NKJV have “God” in Genesis 3:5, breaking the cross reference to Psalm 82:5, 6, Isaiah 24:20-22, Jude 6 and 2 Peter 24.

White’s next target is the AV1611 reading “*his cross*” in Colossians 2:14, versus “*the cross*” found in the NASV, NIV and other apostate modern versions. See *Appendix, Table A1*. White seeks to reassure the reader with the comment that “*the KJV rendering is proper, but it is not so literal as some others [NASV, NIV]. There is, of course, no effort being made to hide the identity of the cross or in any way separate Christ from His work at Calvary.*”

Isn’t there just.

*“For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect”* 1 Corinthians 1:17

*“But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world”* Galatians 6:14.

*“And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven”* Colossians 1:20.

Many crosses had blood on them. Only “*the blood of his cross*” was effective in “*blotting out the hand writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us*”

through the work of the Lord Jesus Christ at Calvary, **“who took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross”** Colossians 2:14.

White<sup>3 p 144</sup> now seeks to alter the AV1611’s **“peculiar people”** in 1 Peter 2:9 to **“own special people”** NKJV and **“people belonging to God”** NIV. Other modern versions share the NKJV, NIV readings. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

White’s explanation in favour of the alteration is that **“the language is changed, for “peculiar” does not mean “strange” but “a possession,” just as the KJV translates the very same term at Ephesians 1:14.”**

**“Possession”** is appropriate in Ephesians 1:14 because Paul is referring to **“the redemption of the purchased possession”** i.e. **“the saints”** verse 1, of whom Paul says, **“after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise”** because the Lord Jesus Christ **“hath made us accepted in the beloved. In whom we have redemption, through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace”** Ephesians 1:6b, 7.

But White<sup>3 p 148</sup> uses the proposed alteration for mounting a further attack on Dr Mrs Riplinger.

**“A very sad example of the utter lack of charity in the writings of KJV Only advocates presents itself with reference to this passage...The character of [Gail Riplinger’s] writings is seen in her comments on Palmer’s defence of the NIV rendering of 1 Peter 2:9, found on pages 170-171 of her book [New Age Versions]...Gail Riplinger neglects to mention the translation of the very same term by the KJV as “possession” at Ephesians 1:14.”**

Because the AV1611’s use of **“possession”** in Ephesians 1:14 is correct. See above. Its use of **“peculiar”** in 1 Peter 2:9 is also correct, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains<sup>14 p 170-1, 7 Part 6</sup>, her emphases.

**“Unwilling to bear “his reproach,” the NIV’s Edwin Palmer pushes the “peculiar people” of Titus 2:14 and 1 Peter 2:9 into the closet...Palmer writes: “...a peculiar people. Today that means odd. It should be...”**

**“It meant odd when Peter and Paul wrote it and when Moses wrote it...”**

**““Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people” Exodus 19:5.**

**“Webster’s says ‘odd’ means “unusual,” and ‘peculiar people’ means: different from the usual or norm; the people of Israel; - used of themselves by many Christian bodies.”**

Intended by God to be **“a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation”** Exodus 19:6, Israel would appear odd to other nations.

**“After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances. Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein: I am the LORD your God”** Leviticus 18:3, 4.

White accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of negligence with respect to her not citing Ephesians 1:14 but he fails to mention that she quotes Exodus 19:5 and Webster’s dictionary definition of ‘peculiar people.’

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues, exposing White’s **“utter lack of”** of ‘consistency’ in his remarks about he comments on Edwin Palmer, who *did* remove ‘peculiar’ from the verses cited and replaced it with an inferior and more limited reading.

*“White wants to limit the Holy Ghost’s ability to use the word of God as intended, that is, as “a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart” (Heb. 4:12). The KJV’s use of words which can communicate **more** than one meaning facilitates this. White would limit the Bible’s vocabulary to **his** limited vocabulary and **his** narrow semasiology. For example, the KJV’s use of “peculiar” gives the reader both meanings of that word. It can be from the Latin *peculiarus* meaning “one’s own property;” or as Webster defines it: “different from the usual.” The NIV’s “people belonging to God” denotes **only** the former. The KJV’s “peculiar people” is defined in Webster’s 5<sup>th</sup> edition Collegiate Dictionary as, “Jehovah’s own people; the people of Israel; - used of themselves of many Christian bodies.” Hence **both** definitions of peculiar are in the dictionary, giving the reader a picture of how God views us **and** how the world views us.”*

White appears to express, his emphasis, some surprise with respect to Romans 15:16, where the AV1611 term **“ministering”** has been embellished with *“as a priest”* in the NASV and altered to read *“with priestly duty”* in the NIV. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

*“Many KJV Only advocates see shades of Roman Catholicism in the NASB and NIV at Romans 15:16. The use of the term “priest” is what causes the charges to be made against the modern versions [not surprisingly]. Yet, again, we find the Greek text in full support of the modern readings. In fact, the entire passage is placed in “priestly” language, for Paul is purposefully drawing from familiar terms from the Old Testament to make a point...The term translated “minister” at the beginning of the verse is the very same term used in the Greek version of the Old Testament to describe the ministering of the priests in the Temple. The word translated “ministering as a priest” by the NASB and “the priestly duty” by the NIV comes from the very Greek term for “priest,” which is found in one Apocryphal work meaning “priestly service.” The modern translations recognize the context in which this word is found and translate it accordingly, bringing out meaning that is, quite simply, obscured in the KJV. This passage in no way even hints at a sacramental priesthood as found in Roman Catholicism.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>119 p 576</sup> indicates that Paul likens the New Testament saint to a burnt offering on an altar but also to **“a living sacrifice”** Romans 12, matching the offering of *the Levites*.

**“And Aaron shall offer the Levites before the LORD for an offering of the children of Israel, that they may execute the service of the LORD”** Numbers 8:11.

This picture of **“the offering up of the Gentiles”** that Paul describes in Romans 15:16 is distinct from *“the ministering of the priests in the Temple.”* **“Being sanctified by the Holy Ghost,”** this offering will carry forward the Lord’s work to the present day.

**“For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ”** Ephesians 4:12.

But inspection of *“the entire passage,”* verses 15-24, indicates an emphasis on *missionary* language rather than on *“priestly”* language,” e.g. **“Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named”** verse 20, **“But now having no more place in these parts”** verse 23, **“whenever I take my journey to Spain”** verse 24.

So insertion of the term *“priestly duty,”* which White justifies, not by means of scripture but by means of an *“Apocryphal work,”* together with, it seems, the notorious LXX<sup>8 p 7</sup> - to which White alludes on the previous page - is both inappropriate and unnecessary, regardless of any Catholic connotations, because the ministry of an Old Testament priest was **“that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins”** Hebrews 5:1b, a ministry per-

formed jointly by the high priest and his fellow priests, e.g. Leviticus 1:1-9, “*the sons of Aaron the priest*” verse 7.

And the Old Testament equivalent of the New Testament missionary such as Paul was not the priest but *the prophet*.

*“And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth”* Isaiah 49:6.

*“Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations”* Jeremiah 1:5.

*“For thus saith the LORD God of Israel unto me; Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it”* Jeremiah 25:15.

*“Now the word of the LORD came unto Jonah the son of Amittai, saying, Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before me”* Jonah 1:1, 2.

Many other examples could be adduced but the above demonstrate that “*the entire passage*” has a distinctly different emphasis from that assumed by James White.

In sum, contrary to James White’s opinion but to paraphrase it nevertheless, the AV1611 “*recognizes the context in which this word [“ministering”] is found and translate(s) it accordingly, bringing out meaning that is, quite simply, obscured in*” the modern versions.

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 143ff</sup> has these comments about White’s evaluation of Romans 15:16, his emphases.

*“According to every programmed clone who was devoting his life to replacing the AV, the word [for “ministering”] had been mistranslated in The Bishops’ Bible, Coverdale’s Bible, Matthew’s Bible, The Geneva Bible, Tyndale, and the King James Bible...The word indicated a “temple,” but after criticizing the AV for translating the word (in Acts 19:37) as “churches,” the programmed clones converted [the word] into a priest (“priestly”) by the man to whom God revealed the church. Strange mentality.*

*“If they could convert the apostle Paul into an Old Testament Levitical “priest,” by retranslating “ministering” (Rom. 15:16) they would do it. That would make them...RULERS over [the Body of Christ]. This is what the Levites did in the Old Testament...”*

Concerning the NASV, NIV insertions of “priest” and “priestly,” Dr Ruckman observes.

*“Neither word is found in one Greek variant “extant” in any family or text type of Greek manuscript...To cite White’s comment<sup>3 p 66, 87</sup> on Erasmus’ ending on Revelation, chapter 22... “There is no Greek manuscript extant for “priest” or “priestly.” I wonder what Paul would have thought if you had read his “original” back to him as it showed up in the NIV and NASV?...”*

White states with respect to the closing verses of Revelation 22, “*The TR often gives readings that place it in contrast with the united testimony of the Majority Text...Often this is due to Erasmus’ importing of entire passages from the Latin Vulgate. This is how Erasmus came up with “the book of life” at Revelation 22:19 rather than the reading of the Greek manuscripts, “the tree of life.” Seemingly the edition of the Latin Vulgate that*

Erasmus used to translate the last six verses of Revelation into Greek contained this reading, and it survived...to end up serving as the basis of the KJV." See **Chapter 4**.

Dr Ruckman continues.

“**The Greek text is in full support of the modern readings.**” (**Although the words “priest” and “priestly” are found nowhere in ANY Greek text.**) “In fact, the entire passage is placed in priestly language...The very Greek term for “priest” which is found in...” Guess where? You guessed it, **nowhere** in any Biblical text, of **one verse** in any Greek New Testament. It is found in one APOCRYPHAL work, meaning “priestly service.”

“Apocryphal works” are found in Catholic Bibles...All roads lead to Rome...

“Now here is what **THE BOOK** says:

“**1. Every Christian is a priest** in a “priesthood” (1 Pet. 2). This is the first fundamental of the Protestant Reformation...

“**2. New Testament priests never** offered up people, or physical sacrifices of any kind (Heb. 13:15-16; 1 Pet. 2:5). Their sacrifices were **spiritual sacrifices** and preaching the Gospel to Gentiles was **NOT** one of them.

“**3. Gentiles are literal, physical people.** No Old Testament priest “**ministered the Gospel**”...White says: “Paul is purposefully drawing from familiar terms from the Old Testament to make a point... **IN THE GREEK VERSION** of the Old Testament to describe the ministering of the priests **IN THE TEMPLE.**”

“White lied again: Paul didn’t have any “Greek version of the Old Testament,” let alone “**THE**” Greek version. Not one Scholarship Only advocate has ever looked at one copy of one **single** “Greek version of the Old Testament” written **before** A.D. 190 (the writers for the Hexapla). Every “Greek version of the Old Testament” that is “extant” was **written more than 200 years after the completion of the New Testament.** (See all the manuscript evidence for all the so-called “LXX readings in *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, 1970...)...

“**4. Paul never likens any God-called minister** (1 Cor. 9:1-25) to anything connected with the Old Testament Priesthood except in regards to material support (1 Cor. 9:7-14). The AV uses seven different Greek words for the New Testament minister...[The NIV and the NASV] only picked out **ONE word** to “diddle” with: the ministering of Romans 15:16. They saw, in that word, an opportunity to reinforce their positions as Levitical, Nicolaitan “priests” set up to instruct, guide, and **JUDGE** the Body of Christ (Deut. 21:1-5)...

“**5. In the New Testament, the body of the believer is the “temple”** (1 Cor. 6:19). How do you perform “priestly duties” in **that** temple? All that goes on in **that temple** are transactions between the One who owns the temple, and the “priest” that is inside it. (See Gal. 5:22-23; Heb. 4:12-13; and 2 Cor. 10:4-5). The NIV and NASV readings therefore hint at...that a Gentile gets saved **BY A PRIEST DOING SOMETHING IN A TEMPLE.**

“That is **exactly** what the Catholic custodians of manuscript “B” (Vaticanus) [a “great codex” according to James White<sup>3 p 33</sup>] have taught since A.D. 400, a priest must offer a **literal** sacrifice inside a literal building (“priestly duties”). But this is exactly how a Gentile is **NOT** saved.

“**6. All Gentiles are saved by spiritual priests** telling them the glorious good news (Acts 15:31) that “priestly duties” performed by a “priest” contribute absolutely **nothing** to their salvation (Rom. 4-5, 10, etc.). The NASV and NIV...just took another long step to-

ward Rome. *The atrocious Greek manuscript that took precedence in their translating work...was from Rome.*”

To paraphrase James White again, *“In the AV1611, this passage in no way even hints at a sacramental priesthood as found in Roman Catholicism BUT IN THE NIV, NASV IT DOES.”*

White’s final examples<sup>3 p 145-6</sup> in this chapter consist of 8 verses for which he asserts that, *“obscure or unclear translations in the KJV are updated and corrected in the NKJV.”*

These verses are; Ephesians 4:12, 2 Timothy 3:17, Hebrews 13:21, where according to White, *“the KJV’s use of the term “perfect”...[obscures] the intention of the author in so doing. The NKJV makes the sense much clearer with its use of “equipping” and “complete,””* 2 Timothy 3:12, *“a very unfortunate KJV rendering”* where *“will live godly”* should be replaced by *“desire to live godly,”* Romans 12:8, where *“simplicity”* should be replaced by a term that today means *“generosity”* or *“liberality,”* Luke 3:14, where *“Do violence to no man”* should instead be *“Do not intimidate anyone,”* 2 Timothy 3:3, Titus 1:8, where *“those that are good”* and *“good men”* should be cut down simply to *“good,”* because, White’s emphasis *“The texts are better understood as referring to the general concept of “good” being despised or loved. The KJV limits this to good men, though the term “men” is nowhere in the Greek but is assumed from the form of the Greek term.”* See *Appendix, Table A1.*

Without explicitly saying so, White is attacking Dr Mrs Riplinger yet again, because she addresses<sup>14 p 161-173</sup> all 8 verses in Chapter 9 of her book *New Age Versions*, entitled *Men Shall Be Unholy*. White thereby conveniently evades having to address Dr Mrs Riplinger’s pertinent observations about the changes that the modern versions make in these verses. He further distances himself from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s insights by resorting explicitly to the NKJV alternatives, some of which differ from the modern readings that Dr Mrs Riplinger has sampled from the group of modern translations generically entitled *“new versions”* for comparison with those of the AV1611.

She states *“God’s goal for Christians is spiritual perfection”* and of the term *“equipping”* that the NKJV substitutes for *“perfecting”* in Ephesians 4:12, she states, *“Campers are equipt, but not necessarily perfect.”*

Note that Psalm 37:37 states *“Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace.”*

Ephesians 4:13-15 distinguishes the *“mark”* of *“a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ”* and contrasts *“a perfect man,”* who has *“learned Christ”* Ephesians 4:20 with *“other Gentiles...alienated from the life of Christ”* Ephesians 4:17-19.

And as *“the end of that man is peace”* in Psalm 37:37, the end of *“the perfecting of the saints”* Ephesians 4:12 is the *“increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love”* Ephesians 4:16.

Paul writes in a similar vein to the Philippians with respect to his aspiration for *“the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord...that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings...”* Philippians 3:8, 10 while acknowledging, *“Not as though I had already attained either were already perfect: but I follow after...I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus”* Philippians 3:12-14.



Paul urges his readers to “*press toward the mark*” for “*the edifying of the body of Christ*” Ephesians 4:12 – see above – and maintain a consistent standard for “*a perfect man*” in the next two verses.

***“Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing”*** Philippians 3:15, 16.

Paul has the same exhortation in Colossians 3:14, with respect to the “*increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love*” Ephesians 4:16.

***“And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness.”***

Concerning the term “*complete*” which the NKJV substitutes for “*perfect*” in 2 Timothy 3:17 and Hebrews 13:21, Dr Mrs Riplinger states “*College students may complete their degree but are not necessarily...perfect.*”

And the NKJV’s use of “*complete*” in the above passages has not even “*updated*” the AV1611 usage of “*perfect*.”

***“Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God”*** Colossians 4:12.

The completeness would correspond to the believer’s realization of and stance “*in all the will of God*” and the perfection corresponds to his fulfillment of it for “*the edifying of the body of Christ.*” As Paul states in Colossians 4:17, “*And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.”*

Hebrews 13:20, 21 exhibit the same emphasis.

***“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.”***

Note also Colossians 2:10.

***“And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power.”***

Ephesians 4:12-16 explains the term “*perfect*” for the Christian with respect his part in for “*the edifying of the body of Christ*” and Colossians 2:10-14 provides the equivalent explanation for the word “*complete*” with respect to the believer’s membership of and induction into that Body by following the Lord’s exhortation “*Ye must be born again*” John 3:3, 7. Colossians 2:14-16 gives the full description of “*the new creature*” 2 Corinthians 5:17 and of how that creature came into being through “*the faith of the operation of God*” Colossians 2:12.

Dr Mrs Riplinger also has this observation, which White studiously avoided in his comments, making no reference in his book to the relevant verse whatsoever.

*“Perfection is truly censored from the new versions. Matthew 5 closes with “Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” New versions<sup>8 p 57-8</sup> omit the preceding verse which would lead to that perfection.”*

***“But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you”*** Matthew 5:44.

Further to 2 Timothy 3:17, the NKJV's "thoroughly" is weaker than the AV1611's "**throughly**" which has the sense of through-and-through. An individual may study the scriptures "thoroughly" but they may not dwell in him "**richly**" Colossians 3:16 or have entered into him "**throughly**."

Concerning the AV1611's "very unfortunate KJV rendering" of "**will live godly**" in 2 Timothy 3:12, which should be changed to "**desire to live godly**," Dr Mrs Riplinger states, "Lot "sat in the gate"; later "he lingered." Had he adopted the "abundance of idleness ascribed to the people of Sodom [Ezekiel 16:49]? C. S. Lewis' Screwtape Letters warned of Satan's ploy to substitute mental assent for 'menial labor'."

White forgot that "**The desire accomplished is sweet to the soul: but it is abomination to fools to depart from evil**" Proverbs 13:19. "**To depart from evil**" requires more than a "**desire to live godly**" as the wretched Balaam discovered.

"**Who can count the dust of Jacob, and the number of the fourth part of Israel? Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his!**" Numbers 23:10.

He didn't and it wasn't.

Job understood the expression "**will live godly**" with respect to its accomplishment.

"**And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding**" Job 28:28.

So did Nehemiah.

"**But the former governors that had been before me were chargeable unto the people, and had taken of them bread and wine, beside forty shekels of silver; yea, even their servants bare rule over the people: but so did not I, because of the fear of God**" Nehemiah 5:15.

And Paul.

"**Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences**" 2 Corinthians 5:11.

"**Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God**" 2 Corinthians 7:1.

White doesn't.

Both the AV1611 and the NKJV have the same ending to 2 Timothy 3:12, i.e. "**shall suffer persecution**" but NKJV adherents can obviously postpone persecution for as long as their "**desire**" is not "**accomplished**." Or they may be deluded into thinking that so long as the "**desire**" is present, so is the persecution, which it isn't.

On the other side of the ledger, Peter gives fair warning for those who would persecute "**all that will live godly in Christ Jesus**."

"**Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you: Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead**" 1 Peter 4:4, 5.

(Perhaps the rich young ruler feared "**evil speakings**" against him, 1 Peter 2:1, when he drew back from the Lord's exhortation in Matthew 19:21, "**Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me.**")

But persecution for “*all that will live godly in Christ Jesus*” is one thing. The fate of the persecutor is something else.

*“But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men”* 2 Peter 3:7.

In sum, the believers who are “*complete in Christ*” and “*in all the will of God*” are charged with “*perfecting holiness in the fear of God*” for the purpose of the “*increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger observes<sup>14 p 171</sup> with respect to the NKJV’s substitution of “*liberality*” for “*simplicity*” in Romans 12:8, “*At the root of all the rhetoric about the need for new versions lies the true cause – covetousness. “The love of money is the root of all evil”* [1 Timothy 6:10]. *Some “destroy souls to get dishonest gain” (Ezekiel 22:27\*). Are there ministries which promote the new versions because, they, in turn, pack their treasuries?”*

\*A passage that White did not choose to discuss but the context, verses 25-29 reveals that the antonym of “*honest*” – see remarks earlier – has the same sense in scripture as it does today. Note the terms “*conspiracy*” in verse 25 and “*lies*” in verse 28 that accompany the term “*dishonest.*”

She goes on to expose “*the sordid details of “intense fighting” and “battles” over the profits to ensue*” from the publication of the RV and ASV as “*“commercial ventures,”*” disclosed by none other than “*Philip Schaff, the chairman of their American Committee,*” from whose autobiography the above quotes were taken. See remarks on 1 Timothy 6:10 earlier.

New version clearly editors hope for giving “*with liberality*” from the sales of their compilations, via the generosity of the buyers.

But once again, the NKJV has not updated anything. The term “*liberality*” occurs twice in the AV1611, in 1 Corinthians 16:3 and 2 Corinthians 8:2, on each occasion, correctly, with respect to the contribution “*for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem.*” Romans 15:25, 26, not as part of any “*commercial venture,*” such as bible sales, where the participants have to speculate (liberally or generously) in order to accumulate (even more liberally or generously).

White also forgot to check the 4 additional verses in the AV1611 where the term “*simplicity*” is used.

*“And with Absalom went two hundred men out of Jerusalem, that were called; and they went in their simplicity, and they knew not any thing”* 2 Samuel 15:11.

*“How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorers delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge?”* Proverbs 1:22.

*“For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward”* 2 Corinthians 1:12.

*“But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ”* 2 Corinthians 11:3.

Each time the term is used, it means easy to understand, or to take at face value (though sometimes to the individual’s detriment, Proverbs 1:22) with no hidden depths, just as the term means today.

Luke 14:13, 14 provide an illustration of giving “*with simplicity*” i.e. with no strings attached, for the sake of “*the poor with you always*” Mark 14:7, with no possibility of ‘a return on investment’ in this life. This reading vindicates “*simplicity*” in Romans 12:8.

***“But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.”***

White’s notion that alteration of Luke 3:14, where the AV1611’s “*Do violence to no man*” should give way to the NKJV’s “*Do not intimidate anyone*” shows that he has overlooked Matthew 2:16, “***Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently enquired of the wise men.***”

And Luke 13:1, “***There were present at that season some that told him of the Galilaeans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.***”

And Matthew 27:26-31, “***Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified. Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify him.***”

***“Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also...”*** Acts 12:1-3.

“***Violence,***” not mere ‘intimidation,’ marked the Roman occupation of Judea and Galilee during Jesus’s time on earth at the First Advent and the days of the early church immediately following.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 173</sup> states, “***“This know that in the last days men shall be FIERCE”*** 2 Timothy 3:2. *The hardhearted fierceness which will characterize the “last days” man is fed by the new versions.*”

She notes that the new versions omit<sup>8 p 57-8, 19 p 39</sup> Matthew 5:44 and Mark 11:26 and states, “***The beheading of Christians during the tribulation receives no censure from [the new versions] in the following verses, “Neither repented they of their murders”*** Revelation 9:20.”

She then lists Luke 3:14, 2 Timothy 3:3, Titus 1:8 and contrasts the changes between the AV1611 readings and the NKJV substitutions that White ‘prefers.’

Gail Riplinger’s penetrating insights certainly help to explain “*the hardhearted fierceness*” of her critics, such as James White.

It is further noteworthy that the NKJV’s alteration of “***those that are good***” 2 Timothy 3:3 and “***good men***” Titus 1:8 to “*good*” corresponds to a similar alteration in Matthew 19:17, where the AV1611 has “***Why callest thou me good?***” where the NIV and the NKJV footnote follow the DR, JR, JB, NWT with “*Why do you ask me about what is*

good?” See *Appendix, Table A1*. (This verse will be addressed in more detail when White later attempts to justify the alteration<sup>3 p 254</sup>.)

Dr Hills<sup>65 p 143</sup> effectively disposes of the NIV, NKJV footnote or f.n. reading, which is also that of White’s favourite, the NASV. See also Dr Ruckman<sup>121 p 370</sup>.

*“Rendel Harris (1891) had this comment to make on the reading, Why askest thou Me concerning the good. “A text of which we should certainly say a priori that it was a Gnostic depravation. Most assuredly this is a Western reading, for it is given by D a b c e ff g h. But it will be said that we have also to deal with Aleph B L and certain versions. Well, according to Westcott and Hort, Aleph and B were both written in the West, probably at Rome. Did Roman texts never influence one another?”*

*“The unbiased student will agree with Harris’ diagnosis of the case. It is surely very likely that this reading, redolent as it is of Greek wisdom, originated among Gnostic heretics of a pseudo-philosophic sort. The 2<sup>nd</sup> century Gnostic teacher Valentinus and his disciples Heracleon and Ptolemaeus are known to have philosophized much on Matt. 19:17, and it could easily have been one of these three who made this alteration in the sacred text. Whoever it was, he no doubt devised this reading in order to give the passage a more philosophical appearance. Evidently he attempted to model the conversation of Jesus with the rich young man into a Socratic dialogue. The fact that this change made Matthew disagree with Mark and Luke did not bother him much, for, being a heretic, he was not particularly interested in the harmony of the Gospels with each other.*

*“Orthodox Christians, we may well believe, would scarcely have made so drastic a change in the text of Matthew, but when once this new reading had been invented by heretics, they would accept it very readily, for theologically it would be quite agreeable to them. Christ’s question, Why callest thou Me good, had troubled them, for it seemed to imply that He was not perfectly good. (Not that it actually does imply this when rightly interpreted, but it seemed to.) What a relief to reject this reading and receive in its place the easier one, Why askest thou Me concerning the good. It is no wonder, therefore, that this false reading had a wide circulation among orthodox Christians of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century and later. But the true reading, Why callest thou Me good, continued to be read and copied. It is found today in the Sahidic version, in the Peshitta, and in the vast majority of the Greek manuscripts, including W. which is probably the third oldest uncial manuscript of the New Testament in existence.*

*“Thus when the Traditional Text stands trial in a test passage such as Matt. 19 17, it not only clears itself of the charge of being spurious but even secures the conviction of its Western and Alexandrian rivals. The reading found in these latter two texts, Why askest thou Me concerning the good, is seen to possess all the earmarks of a “Gnostic depravation.” The R.V., A.S.V., R.S.V., N.E.B. and other modern versions [NIV, NASV, NKJV f.n.], therefore, are to be censured for serving up to their readers this stale crumb of Greek philosophy in place of the bread of life.”*

Amen to that. But it appears that for 2 Timothy 3:3, Titus 1:8, the NKJV reverted to “this stale crumb of Greek philosophy in place of the bread of life” in its text, along with the usual suspects; NIV, NASV, DR, JR, JB, NWT.

Perhaps, sensing that they are in “*the last days*” 2 Timothy 3:1, they were keen to avoid having “*violence*” done unto them by the “*despisers of those that are good.*”

Be that as it may, the above considerations reveal that the NKJV substitutions update nothing, make nothing “clearer,” let alone “much clearer” and “obscure the intention of the author in so doing.”

White<sup>3 p 146</sup> concludes this chapter with a typical ‘whitewash,’ in which he insists that, “*comparison of various translations of the Bible [as usual, unspecified] is often very useful in ascertaining the meaning of the passage being studied.*”

He even describes the AV1611 as “*one of those many fine translations...when used in conjunction with such fine modern translations as the NKJV, NIV, and NASB...is often helpful in grasping the literal meaning of the terms involved.*”

White is back<sup>3 p 7</sup> to “*multiple translations*” again and reveals once more his lack of missionary vision. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s admonition<sup>96 p 92-3</sup> is again appropriate. See remarks towards the end of **Chapter 5**.

*“It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.”*

White insists further with respect to the modern translators that, “*Their goal is not to corrupt God’s Word but to preserve it and accurately pass it on to future generations*” and assures his readers that “*Whenever you encounter a supposed “change” in the Bible’s text...look carefully at the available information. You will discover that there are reasons for the differences, and that there is no rationale at all for running to theories of conspiracies or evil intentions on the part of the modern translators.*”

If the reader is prepared to “*look carefully at the available information*” set out in this chapter, he should see that the modern translators signally missed their goal, if they were ever aiming for it and that the “*reasons for the differences*” for “*a supposed [actual] “change” in the Bible’s text*” are not such as would pass muster with the verdict of the Psalmist.

**“The judgements of the Lord are true and righteous altogether”** Psalm 19:9b.

That is, they are not “**of the Lord,**” are definitely not “**true**” and certainly not “**righteous.**”

White says that, his emphasis, “*In a majority of the passages examined in the preceding pages, translations such as the NASB and NIV have been seen to surpass the KJV with reference to clarity and ease of comprehension far more often than the reverse.*”

Inspection of this chapter will show that “*the reverse*” is true for all “*the passages examined in the preceding pages.*”

And White is confident that “*No grand conspiracies have been uncovered, no attempts to hide doctrines or beliefs by mistranslating the text have been found.*”

But as Solomon observes, “**He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him**” Proverbs 18:17.

When the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible “**searcheth**” James White, according to Hebrews 4:12, one of the verses that White agreed should be tampered with, “**For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of**

*the thoughts and intents of the heart*” a great deal is uncovered that James White would probably have preferred to have remained concealed.

1. White’s “*standard*” for evaluating so-called “*translational differences*” is a *question*. “*What did the original author of Scriptures say at this point?*” In other words, “*Yea, hath God said?*” Genesis 3:1.
2. White’s alteration of Acts 20:28 implies that the flock should *not* be fed. Ezekiel 34:2 insists that they *should*.
3. White’s treatment of Ephesians 4:24 obscures the identity of “*the new man*” in the believer as the Lord Jesus Christ and casts doubt upon the permanence of “*the new man*” in the believer.
4. White confuses works-based salvation with suffering as a Christian for the Lord’s sake, 2 Timothy 2:12 and confounds the “*profession of our faith*” Hebrews 10:23, with a bogus “*profession of hope*” when the Christian’s “*blessed hope*” is the Lord Jesus Christ, Titus 2:13.
5. White confuses unbelief in the Lord Jesus Christ, incurring “*the wrath of God*” John 3:36, with a saved individual’s disobedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, even though Paul fell into such disobedience, Acts 21:4. He lost two years out of his ministry, Acts 24:27 but did not incur “*the wrath of God*” as it “*abideth upon*” the unbeliever,
6. White confuses once-for-all salvation, as in Acts 2:47, 1 Corinthians 1:18, with sanctification, which is past, present and future, e.g. Hebrews 10:10, John 17:17, 1 Thessalonians 5:23.
7. White leaves “*you,*” the believing reader, “*dead in trespasses and sins*” in Ephesians 2:1, forgetting that the words “*hath he quickened*” in Ephesians 2:5 will therefore refer to “*us,*” i.e. the fully saved in the new versions and not “*you,*” i.e. the progressively saved.
8. White unwittingly or otherwise, condones “*New Age cosmology*” as explained by Dr Mrs Riplinger and forgets that “*the whole world lieth in wickedness*” 1 John 5:19, regardless of whatever “*age*” it is passing through until the Second Advent.
9. White then tries to renovate “*hell*” by resorting to the transliterations *hades* and *sheol*, effectively lending credence to the New Age theory of reincarnation, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains in *New Age Versions*, in her chapter entitled *Judgement or Internment?* White also reveals that he doesn’t know the difference between “*soul*” and “*spirit.*”
10. White condones the versions that remove the name “*Lucifer*” or “*Lux-fero - Light-bearer*” from Isaiah 14:12 and attempt to merge Satan with the Lord Jesus Christ, by substitution of the term “*morning star.*” He also fails to differentiate appropriately between “*gods*” and “*God.*”
11. White appears unable to appreciate the vital distinction between “*his cross*” with respect to the cross of Lord Jesus Christ in Colossians 2:14 and the redemption that He wrought at Calvary and “*the cross*” as such, that was simply a means of execution for all its other victims.
12. White then tries to evade the unpalatable fact that “*the love of money is the root of all evil*” 1 Timothy 6:10 and thereby excuse the mercenary motives of modern bible version publishers, such as Thomas Nelson.

13. White seeks to downplay the importance of studying the scriptures by supporting those modern versions which eliminate “*study*” from 2 Timothy 2:15.
14. White objects to the terms “*quick and powerful*” in Hebrews 4:12, forgetting that this expression is far more appropriate for a sword thrust as indicated in the verse than, for the context, the milder terms “*living*” and “*active*.” He would dissuade the reader from believing in the power of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, as the written embodiment of “*The voice of the Lord*” Psalm 29:4, 5, “*the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:23b - with “*liveth*” in the correct context.
15. White condones the insertion of the words “*priest*” or “*priestly*” in Romans 15:16 by the modern versions without any Greek manuscript evidence, while ‘inconsistently’ and with a ‘double standard’ accusing Erasmus of doing likewise with the last 6 verses of Revelation 22, via the Latin Vulgate. He also fails to distinguish between the ministry of the Old Testament priest and that of the prophet.
16. White attempts to mislead the reader by his insistence that various terms in the AV1611, such as “*honest*,” “*peculiar*” and “*simplicity*” do not incorporate contemporary meanings. “*Comparing spiritual things with spiritual*” 1 Corinthians 2:13 shows that they do.
17. White baulks at God’s call to spiritual perfection for all believers, as expressed in Ephesians 4:12 and shies away from “*all that will live godly in Christ Jesus*” 2 Timothy 3:12. It may be that he doesn’t want to incur the consequences of fulfilling Ephesians 4:12 and 2 Timothy 3:12 as found in the AV1611, because they may be uncomfortable.
18. White fails to appreciate how men will be “*fierce*” in the “*perilous times*” of “*the last days*” 2 Timothy 3:1-3 and fails to warn his readers accordingly, as Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly does.

James White would probably dismiss all 18 of the above charges out of hand but it will be interesting to see what happens at “*the judgement seat of Christ*” Romans 14:10 – not “*God*” as in the NIV and other modern counterfeits. (Note that Romans 14:10 in the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible reads with the AV1611 in Romans 14:10. See *Appendix, Table A16*.)

Note finally that this chapter has provided further refutation of the fifth of White’s main postulates, namely that the modern translations often yield superior readings to the AV1611. This chapter has shown that they do not. Ever.



### **Chapter 7 – “Textual Differences”**

James White designates<sup>3 p 149</sup> this chapter as “*the major portion of our investigation of the KJV Only movement.*”

The chapter consists of White’s most concerted efforts to discredit the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible so far, essentially by resorting to manuscript evidence and suitably manipulating it against the AV1611 and in favour of the modern versions.

See **Appendix, Table A1**, for the verses that White refers to in this chapter. The first passages that he mentions are Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11 and states that they “*are addressed in Part Two.*” Summary evidence in favour of these passages as they are found in the AV1611 has been noted<sup>8 p 66, 74</sup> – see **Chapter 3** - but more detailed comments will follow when this study evaluates White’s Part Two.

White adds that “*1 John 5:7-8 [has] already been addressed in chapter 4.*” See extensive comments on this passage in **Chapter 4**.

White<sup>3 p 150</sup> then purports to have identified “*passages showing “parallel influence”*” in the AV1611, so that one of them can be discarded, for example. He also promises to “*explain why at times it is best to go with the minority when those manuscripts carry the greatest weight*” - because he has earlier<sup>3 p 62ff</sup> highlighted certain passages where “*the Textus Receptus follows either a very tiny number of very late manuscripts, or goes so far as to import passages from other sources such as the Latin Vulgate.*”

That is, if the TR editors can do it, so can the new version editors. See **Chapter 4** for a detailed evaluation of White’s duplicitous reasoning as outlined above.

White continues<sup>3 p 152-4</sup> with an extensive discussion of why, generally, “*the older a manuscript is the better it is*” and therefore, his emphasis, “*we cannot simply “count” manuscripts but must weigh them.*”

See **Chapter 5** for a detailed evaluation of this well-worn sample of Satanic chicanery.

Some additional information merits insertion, nevertheless. Having reminded<sup>3 p 151</sup> his readers that “*The largest number of handwritten manuscripts that exist today contain the Byzantine text-type...Because Erasmus used these later manuscripts, the TR [Textus Receptus] is a Byzantine text, and hence the KJV’s New Testament reflects this same manuscript tradition,*” White declares<sup>3 p 152-3</sup> that “*Every one of the papyrus manuscripts we have discovered has been a representative of the Alexandrian, not the Byzantine text-type. The early Fathers who wrote at this time did not use the Byzantine text-type.*”

“*An examination of the early translations of the New Testament reveals they were done on the basis of the Alexandrian type manuscripts, not Byzantine type manuscripts. And the early church fathers who wrote during the early centuries give no evidence in their citations of a familiarity with the Byzantine text-type.*”

Will Kinney writes<sup>126</sup>.

“*In his book, The KJV Only Controversy, on page 152-153 Mr. James White actually says: “Every one of the papyrus manuscripts we have discovered has been a representative of the Alexandrian, not the Byzantine text type” and “The early Fathers who wrote at this time did not use the Byzantine text-type” and “the early translations of the New Testament reveals that they were done on the basis of the Alexandrian type manuscripts, not the Byzantine text-type” and “the early church fathers who wrote during the early centuries give no evidence in their citations of a familiarity with the Byzantine text-type”.*”

*“These are such huge whoppers I could not believe he actually wrote this totally false information in his book. There is tons of evidence that even the early papyrus manuscripts, all of which came from Alexandria Egypt, were a mixed bag and there are many Byzantine readings found in them where they agree with the KJB readings and not the Westcott-Hort Alexandrian copies of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.*

*“Furthermore, concerning the church Fathers, Dean John Burgon compiled over 86,000 citations and quotes of the church Fathers and found that not only did the Textus Receptus exist but it predominated.*

*“The early versions like the Old Latin contain many Traditional Text readings not found in Sinaiticus and Vaticanus as does the Syriac Peshitta. And both of these predate Sinaiticus Vaticanus by 150 years.*

*“Even Dr. Hort of the famed Westcott-Hort text said: “The fundamental Text of late extant Greek MSS generally is beyond all question identical with the dominant Antiochian or Graeco-Syrian Text of the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century.” (Hort, The Factor of Genealogy, pg 92 - as cited by Burgon, Revision Revised, pg 257).*

*“Dean Burgon immediately comments: “We request, in passing, that the foregoing statement may be carefully noted. The Traditional Greek Text of the New Testament, - the TEXTUS RECEPTUS, in short - is, according to Dr. Hort, ‘BEYOND ALL QUESTION the TEXT OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.’”*

*“In other words, at the very time Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were penned, the Byzantine texts were already the predominate texts of the Christian church!”*

Will Kinney’s considered response gives the lie to another of White’s attacks on bible believers, made in the context of the citations from his book above. Cloud<sup>6 Part 1</sup> has this response, his emphases.

*“Consider one more example from White’s book, illustrating his attitude toward those who defend the King James Bible: “It should be axiomatic among Christian scholars that open discussion and liberty should prevail. THAT IS ONE REASON WHY KJV ONLY-ISM HAS FOUND NO TRUE PROPONENT AMONGST CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS: it denies anyone the freedom to examine the KJV on the very same basis as any other translation. The position is, by its nature, anti-intellectual, anti-scholarship, and anti-freedom” (emphasis added) (White, p. 151).*

*“Let me make the following comments on this amazing statement: **First, White sounds exactly like the theological Modernist here.** This is precisely how the haughty Modernist speaks about those who believe the Bible is the infallible Word of God. White’s New Evangelical training at a Southern Baptist university and at Fuller Seminary comes through loud and clear. The Modernist charges Bible believers with not granting “liberty” to those who hold opposing views. He charges them with being anti-intellectual, anti-scholarship, and anti-freedom. I am sorry, but the view that the Bible is the infallible Word of God cannot possibly allow freedom for “other views.” If it is the infallible Word of God, it must be defended as such and no quarter can be given. Likewise, the view that God has preserved His Word in the Received Text and the King James Bible cannot possibly grant liberty for other views to be equal, because the other views promote Bibles which the King James Bible defender views as corrupt. A corrupt text can never be equal to a preserved one, and an impure translation can never be equal to an accurate one. It is fine for James White to be broadminded on this topic. His position allows him to do so, but that is impossible for the Received Text-King James Bible defender. It is not that the*

*KJV defender is “anti-intellectual” or “anti-freedom.” It is simply that his position does not allow it.*

*“Second, White is lying here. He says there are NO proponents of “KJV Onlyism” among Christian scholars. We wonder how Mr. White defines a Christian scholar. Must one have a Ph.D. in textual criticism? If so, James White himself does not qualify. The fact is that White has himself admitted that there are scholars who defend the King James Bible. He mentions some of these in his own book: Dr. Donald Waite (Th.D. with honors from Dallas and Ph.D. from Purdue), Dr. Edward F. Hills (Ph.D. from Harvard), and Dr. Peter Ruckman (Ph.D. from Bob Jones University). Though we don’t agree with Dr. Ruckman on many points, as has been noted already, there can be no doubt that he is a Christian scholar. He has an earned Ph.D., is at home in the biblical languages, and is a brilliant and widely read man on many subjects. I have already said I believe the man is twisted; but that does not mean he is not a genuine Christian scholar. Peter Ruckman is certainly as much a scholar as James White. Dr. Edward Hills was trained at the very highest scholarly level in textual criticism. Dr. Waite has better Greek and Hebrew credentials than James White and has decades more experience with the languages. When Dr. Waite began writing on the topic of Bible versions in 1971, James White was eight years old. While James was growing up and being educated at the feet of New Evangelical compromisers, Dr. Waite was conducting painstaking research projects, such as comparing, word-for-word, the Westcott-Hort Text with the Received Text, the NIV with the KJV, the original 1611 KJV with the modern KJV, the NKJV with the KJV, the NASV with the KJV, etc. James White does not come up to the level of any one of these men in scholarly credentials, yet he puffs himself up with the silly statement that no scholars are “King James only.” It must be a joke, but we are not laughing.*

*“If James White would argue here that Dr. Hills was not “King James Only,” we would remind him that he himself uses Hills as an example of such in his own book.”*

*Cloud then lists scores of individual researchers whom he terms “Christian scholars” and concludes, “All of these men fall into one of the five groups listed by James White as “King James Only” and all are men who have done scholarly research into the issue of Bible texts and versions. Some are linguists and textual scholars; others are not. Most of these men have advanced theological degrees. The others have demonstrated their scholarship by diligent, long-standing personal research. All of these men have published material on the subject of Bible texts and versions. In my estimation, each of these men has done research that is more significant than that done by James White.”*

Apart from his unnecessary jibe at Dr Ruckman, Cloud has highlighted White’s duplicity in some detail.

But White continues, his emphasis, *“Daniel Wallace...cites Philippians 1:14 as an example of a uniquely Byzantine reading that is found in the papyri manuscripts...there are not more than eight such examples to be found. And, we might note that the modern critical texts, the UBS [United Bible Societies] 4<sup>th</sup> and the Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup>, both adopt the Byzantine reading! Why is this significant? It proves that these texts are not engaged in some kind of conspiracy to deny the Byzantine text any place in textual choices, and that when faced with plain evidence, the modern texts will follow that evidence and adopt the proper readings.”*

According to White<sup>3 p 188</sup>, Wallace’s 8 examples include 6 that are not “distinctly Byzantine.””

These 6 verses are Luke 10:21, 14:3, 34, 15:21, John 10:38, 19:11.

Luke 10:21 has the reading “*in spirit*” in the AV1611. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>8 p 158, 62</sup> change the reading to “*the Holy Spirit*,” as found in the RV, Nestle, NASV, NIV, JB, NWT. The alteration obscures the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ, “*being found in fashion as a man*,” Philippians 2:8, has a spirit, 1 Thessalonians 5:23. See also Luke 23:46 and John 13:21.

The same editors add “*or not*” to the Lord’s question in Luke 14:3 “*Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day?*” The NASV, NIV, JB, NWT also add the words. Changes in the other verses appear to be relatively minor.

Unfortunately White doesn’t mention the 7<sup>th</sup> example, which, along with Philippians 1:14 is “*uniquely Byzantine*.” Neither does he explain how the distinction is drawn between that which is “*uniquely Byzantine*” and that which is not quite “*uniquely Byzantine*” so further comment in this respect is not possible

However, he later adds<sup>3 p 180</sup>, his emphasis, “[*Philippians 1:14*] is one of only a very few that can rightly be used to assert that the Byzantine text-type has at least **some** readings that are both ancient and unique. The phrase “*of God*” is found primarily in Alexandrian manuscripts. It is deleted primarily in Byzantine manuscripts, with the notable exception of P46. This is one of the few places where the Byzantine text rightly claims the support of an early papyrus manuscript for a unique, significant reading.”

White’s bald assertion is false, as will be seen but for now, it should be noted that the RV of Westcott and Hort and Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition include the words “*of God*” in Philippians 1:14. This insertion<sup>62</sup> comes from the unregenerate editors of the new Greek texts who influenced Westcott and Hort; Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford. However, White indicates that the later editions of the modern Greek texts, i.e. the United Bible Society’s 4<sup>th</sup> Edition and Nestle’s 27<sup>th</sup> Edition relegate the reading to “*the reference notes and give the reading found in the KJV*.”

White<sup>3 p 180</sup> acknowledges that the NASV, which also has the addition, came from an earlier edition of Nestle’s but he insists that “*when we do find a uniquely Byzantine reading that carries great weight...the modern Greek texts adopt it*,” i.e. “*the reading found in the KJV*,” which omits “*of God*,” it follows that “*they are not on a crusade to do everything possible to “put down” the KJV*.”

He then insists, his emphases, that, “*the reading is one that is **away from** the normal “fuller” text of the Byzantine tradition. If the reverse were true, and the modern texts **removed** “of God” here in opposition to the Byzantine texts, we would certainly find modern KJV Only advocates using this passage as evidence of the “doctrinal inferiority” of modern texts.*”

But “*the reverse*” is not true and White is merely wasting space with idle speculation.

Concerning White’s notion that “*the modern Greek texts...are not on a crusade to do everything possible to “put down” the KJV*,” the truth is otherwise<sup>8 p 37</sup> as a general rule. This fact emerges from inspection of Philippians 1:14 in the modern English versions. Current online versions of the NIV and the NASV retain the addition<sup>127</sup>. Why is this so, if the “*uniquely Byzantine reading*” is reckoned as genuine, even by the editors of “*the modern Greek texts*”? It appears not to have carried as great a weight as White thought it did.

But again, White has not given his readers all the relevant facts. Dr Ruckman has, his emphases<sup>8 p 37, 33 p vi, 328-9, 128, p 8</sup>.

“Someone (!) put so much pressure on the German scholars in Stuttgart, West Germany, that they **reversed a position they had held for eighty years!** They suddenly reinserted 467 **Receptus** readings into their “eclectic” text, which they had omitted in every edition (25) since 1898...”

“Nestlé finally printed, in 1979, a text that differed radically from one hundred years of previous publications. This was done at once, without notice publicly, and it was done with the bland profession that suddenly (*i.e. coincidental with the world-wide distribution of books by Fuller, Hills, and Ruckman*), “We are no longer in the age of Tischendorf and Hort.” Consequently, Nestle reversed field and actually stuck some of the Receptus readings back into his critical text (which he had rejected **since 1880!**) with the lame profession that “new evidence” had turned up [what James White calls “plain evidence”]. Nothing had turned up but the constant confirmation of the Receptus by the Holy Spirit to the tune of an army of Bible believers in America who tore the Alexandrian Greek text of Westcott and Hort to shreds...”

“You will find that when Nestle altered his 467 readings to bring them back into line with the *Textus Receptus*, the weight he used as an alibi was the POPYRI: a bald confession that **the Papyri were RECEPTUS READINGS, NOT ALEXANDRIAN READINGS...**”

“But, no, “there are no **BYZANTINE READINGS BEFORE A.D. 400.**” You mean, you **pretend** that they were to be eliminated if you found **any** readings before A.D. 400, as you had assigned all pre-A.D. 400 manuscripts to another “FAMILY.””

As Dr Ruckman rightly says, his emphasis, this assignation is done on the basis of “**ARBITRARY CONJECTURE.**” Gail Riplinger<sup>8 p 291-2, 14 p 492-511</sup> has illustrated how this conjecture works, with respect to several verses, some of which include important doctrine. The following summary is from this author’s earlier work, with references updated as necessary.

“Gail Riplinger shows how editors of modern Greek texts and new versions appear to have little or no “consistency” in use of their sources. They will sometimes ignore the oldest source in order to select a reading from available Greek mss. which detracts from an important doctrinal reading as found in the AV1611. Compare 1 Corinthians 10:9 and 11:24. Theirs is essentially the position of J. J. Griesbach<sup>65 p 65</sup>, 1745-1812, who stated that “When there are many variant readings in one place, that reading which more than the others manifestly favours the dogmas of the orthodox is deservedly regarded with suspicion”...P46 is one of the 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century papyri and predates Aleph and B by at least 100 years.

<b>Verse Altered by the NIV</b>	<b>Manuscripts</b>	<b>Doctrine Affected</b>
1 Corinthians 7:15	Ignores Aleph Follows P46, B, Majority	
1 Corinthians 10:9	Ignores P46 and Majority Follows Aleph and B	AV1611: “ <b>Neither let us tempt Christ</b> ” NIV: “We should not test the Lord” The NIV reading denies the Deity of Christ by failing to identify Him as “ <b>God</b> ” who sent <b>fiery serpents</b> ”, Numbers 21:6.

1 Corinthians 11:24	Ignores Majority Follows P46, Aleph, B	AV1611: <b>“this is my body which is broken for you”</b> NIV: “This is my body, which is for you”. The NIV reading denies that Christ’s body was <b>“broken”</b> or <b>“pierced”</b> on the cross, John 19:37.
1 Corinthians 13:3	Ignores P46, Aleph, B Follows Majority	
1 Corinthians 14:38	Ignores P46, B, Majority Follows Aleph	

“The favoured manuscripts are diametrically opposite in 1 Corinthians 11:24 and 13:3. Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>14 p 500</sup>, “The “accepted principles of the science of textual criticism” used to justify this ‘shell game’...are illustrations of Timothy’s **“science falsely so called”** and can be summarised in one sentence – “I believe the writer is probably more likely to have said this”.”

Dr Moorman<sup>9</sup> notes the following examples where the latest internet versions<sup>127</sup> of the NASV, NIV ignore the “plain evidence” of the papyri, e.g. P45 from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century<sup>9 p 16</sup>, because the papyri support Textus Receptus and AV1611 readings.

Mark 9:29, **“and fasting”** NASV, NIV omit and ignore P45. The words **“and fasting”** are also found in the pre-350 AD Gothic and pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bibles. See *Appendix, Table A16*.

Luke 12:31, **“of God”** NASV, NIV omit and ignore P45.

John 20:17, **“my”** in the first **“my Father”** NASV, NIV have **“the”** and ignore P66.

Romans 15:19, **“of God”** NASV, NIV omit and ignore P46.

1 Corinthians 5:4, **“Christ...Christ”** NASV, NIV omit and ignore P46.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 121</sup> notes that both the Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac read with the AV1611 in 1 Corinthians 5:4. P46 and White’s “great codex,” Ⲙ, include **“Christ”** on the first occasion in the verse but not on the second. White fails to explain the apparent ‘inconsistency.’

Ephesians 5:9, **“the Spirit”** NASV, NIV have **“the light”** (“Lux-fero”?) and ignore P46 – following P49 instead. P46 is dated AD 200 and is most likely older than P49, which is from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century<sup>9 p 16</sup>.

Hebrews 1:3, **“by himself”** NASV, NIV omit and ignore P46.

1 Peter 5:10, **“Jesus”** NASV, NIV omit and ignore P72, from the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century<sup>9 p 17</sup>.

2 Peter 1:3, **“to glory and virtue”** NASV, NIV change to **“by his own glory and excellence** [NIV “goodness”] and ignore P72.

Dr Moorman’s work illustrates papyri references favourable to the TR and the AV1611 from the 356 doctrinal verses that he selects. These are in ratio 39 to 182<sup>9 p 15-17</sup> or 18%. See comments in *Chapter 3*. However, agreement between the papyri and the TR versus the old uncials underlying the modern Greek texts and modern versions is, overall, much higher than the above list would suggest, at approximately 50%. See this author’s work<sup>8 p 129-134</sup> for an additional summary of the papyri evidence, showing that the Beatty Papyri

P45, P46, vindicate over 60 supposedly 'late' Byzantine or TR-AV1611 readings as early and that the Bodmer Papyrus P66 proves that 18 out of 138 supposedly 'late' Byzantine readings are early, or 13%. An impressive result, compared to White's alleged less-than-eight.

Nevertheless, the above list and that extracted from Dr Mrs Riplinger's work are sufficient to call seriously into question White's notion that "*when faced with plain evidence, the modern texts will follow that evidence and adopt the proper readings.*"

Clearly they don't.

And Dr Mrs Riplinger writes<sup>7 Part 6</sup> with respect to White's assertion about Philipians 1:14.

*"Phil. 1:14: His comment that "This is one of the few places where the Byzantine text rightly claims the support of an early papyrus for a unique, significant reading" reveals his lack of familiarity with the hundreds upon hundreds of instances in which the KJV received support from the early papyri."*

Wilbur N. Pickering carried out extensive evaluation of the sources for the New Testament Text. He says this of papyrus support for the TR-AV1611 Byzantine readings<sup>1 p 170-1, 129 p 76-7</sup>.

*"H. A. Sturz...surveyed "all the available papyri" to discover how many papyrus-supported "Byzantine" readings exist. In trying to decide which were "distinctively Byzantine" readings he made a conscious effort to "err on the conservative side" so that the list is shorter than it might be.*

*"He found, and lists the evidence for, more than 150 "distinctively Byzantine" readings that have early (before 300 AD) papyrus support. He found 170 "Byzantine-Western" readings with early papyrus support. He found 170 "Byzantine-Alexandrian" readings with early papyrus support. He gives evidence for 175 further "Byzantine" readings but which have scattered "Western" or "Alexandrian" support, with early papyrus support. He refers to still another 195 readings where the "Byzantine" reading has papyrus support, but he doesn't bother to list them (apparently he considers these variants to be of lesser consequence)."*

Pickering notes<sup>129 p 224</sup> that *"This means that the early Papyri vindicate "Byzantine" readings in [665] (or [860]) places where there is significant variation. One might wish that Sturz had also given us the figures for "distinctly Western" and "distinctly Alexandrian" readings but how are such expressions to be defined? Where is an objective definition for "Western reading," for example?"*

*"Distinctly Byzantine" readings seem to be defined solely on the basis that modern revisers such as Westcott and Hort, rejected them, by methods that Dr Ruckman refers to above as "ARBITRARY CONJECTURE" and Dr Mrs Riplinger summarises above as "The "accepted principles of the science of textual criticism"...can be summarised in one sentence – "I believe the writer is probably more likely to have said this"."*

Or as Burgon concluded<sup>13 p 397</sup> after his exhaustive analysis of Westcott and Hort's revision, *"My contention is, - NOT that the Theory of Drs Westcott and Hort rests on an INSECURE foundation, but, that it rests on NO FOUNDATION AT ALL."* See detailed remarks in **Chapter 3**. It is certainly unclear, therefore, why so-called "Alexandrian" and/or "Western" readings should be accepted at face value as 'early' while early attestation to "*distinctively Byzantine*" readings is either ignored or greatly minimised, e.g. by Daniel Wallace, unless as White<sup>3 p 153</sup> attempts to deny, modern revisers *are*, in fact, "*en-*

gaged in some kind of conspiracy.” White provides no credible clarification but Sturz’s and Pickering’s researches vindicate Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement above on Philippians 1:14 and demonstrate that Wallace’s assertion about a paucity of “*distinctively Byzantine*” readings is a total fabrication.

Pickering continues.

*“The magnitude of this vindication can be more fully appreciated by recalling that only about 30 percent of the New Testament has early papyrus attestation, and much of that 30 percent has only one papyrus. Where more than one covers a stretch of text, each new MS discovered vindicates added Byzantine readings. Extrapolating from the behaviour of those in hand, if we had at least 3 papyri covering all parts of the New Testament, almost all the 5000+ Byzantine readings rejected by the critical (eclectic) [modern Greek] texts would be vindicated by an early papyrus.*

*“It appears that Hort’s statement or treatment of external evidence has no basis in fact.”*

Rather like White’s. What Pickering appears to be saying is that Sturz’s research has totally or partially shown 665 Byzantine readings to be early that he perceives as significant. Using Sturz’s figures and splitting each of the totals for the mixed Byzantine readings, this gives an equivalent number of “*distinctively Byzantine*” readings slightly in excess of 400, for 30% of the New Testament Text, with attestation from only a single papyrus. Extrapolation of the attestation for the entire New Testament Text as Pickering suggests, rounding up to 100%, gives early papyrus support for 4075 (or 5050) of the 5337 Byzantine readings<sup>8 p 41</sup> rejected by Westcott and Hort. This is 76% (or 95%) of the rejected readings, in accord with Pickering’s estimation.

Pickering<sup>8 p 7, 117, 124-6, 129 p 67-8</sup>, citing Kenyon, also disposes of White’s barefaced lie that “*The early Fathers who wrote at this time did not use the Byzantine text-type,*” and also rebuts Kenyon’s attempt to explain away the evident preference for the Traditional or Byzantine Text on the part of the early Church Fathers.

*“Taking the Greek and Latin fathers who died before A.D. 400, their quotations are found to support the Traditional Text in 2630 instances, the “neologian” in 1753.”*

Dr. Ruckman<sup>57 p 22</sup> explains that the “*Neologian text*” includes both “*neutral*” and “*Western*” readings. Both are supposedly earlier than the “*Byzantine*”, the “*Neutral*” text being that of the Alexandrian Codex B, according to Hort<sup>77 p 114</sup>.

Kenyon continues:

*“Nor is this majority due solely to the writers who belong to the end of the period. On the contrary, if only the earliest writers be taken, from Clement of Rome to Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the majority in favour of the Traditional Text is proportionately even greater, 151 to 84. Only in the Western and Alexandrian writers do we find approximate equality of votes on either side.”*

Dr. Ruckman<sup>57 p 22</sup>, cites Miller who found that “*Origen sided with THE TRADITIONAL TEXT (in 200 A.D.!) 460 times while siding with the ‘Neologian’ text 491 times*”.

*“Further”, says Kenyon, “if a select list of thirty important passages be taken for detailed examination, the preponderance of early patristic evidence in favour of the Traditional Text is seen to be no less than 530 to 170.”* That is, White is wrong about a mere 8 “*uniquely Byzantine reading[s]...found in the papyri manuscripts*” and so is Wallace.

White<sup>3 p 155</sup> then launches into a dissertation about verses that have supposedly “*been either repeated or imported from another place in the text.*” He illustrates with the phrase



**“where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched”** found on three occasions in the AV1611, Mark 9:44, 46, 48 but only once in the NIV, NASV, which omit or bracket verses 44, 46.

While acknowledging that the manuscripts that support the omissions are in the minority, White insists that the phrase *“has been inserted in later manuscripts in both cases [i.e. as verses 44, 46].”* He explains, his emphasis, *“There is no reason for these verses to have been accidentally omitted, and obviously they were not **purposefully** omitted because all the manuscripts contain the very same words at verse 48.”*

White’s explanation is spurious, because ample reason exists for bible corrupters to omit verses 44, 46 and White can furnish no reason why the modern versions nevertheless retain the AV1611 verse numbering system, even though, supposedly, the absent verses are not part of the scripture. This is also the case for all omissions that White considers to be ‘late additions.’

However, White is confident that his explanation is sufficient for the *purposeful* omission of both these verses from the Gospel of Mark.

*“Both of these verses are rightly removed from the text as not being part of what Mark originally wrote.”*

Jehudi could not have put it any plainer.

**“And it came to pass, that when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he cut it with the penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that was on the hearth”** Jeremiah 36:23.

The same is true for the *purposeful* omission of all other passages of scripture that White designates as ‘late additions.’

Moorman gives overwhelming evidence for the authenticity of Mark 9:44, 46 from a wide variety of sources<sup>9 p 79-80</sup>. Some of these sources, e.g. the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac texts<sup>55 p 49-51</sup> *pre-date* the old uncials, Aleph, B, C, L, W, which are the main representatives of the few manuscripts that omit the verses. The pre-350 AD Gothic and pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bibles also have mark 9:44, 46 as found in the AV1611. See ***Appendix, Table A16.***

The faithful precursors to the AV1611, the bibles of Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p 667</sup> all contain Mark 9:44, 46.

In contrast, White provides not a shred of evidence to show that these verses were later insertions. Therefore, to assume, as White does, that the evidence in favour of Mark 9:44, 46, can simply be brushed aside as of no consequence is hardly consistent with *“the highest standard of truth”* that White professes<sup>3 p vii</sup> to aspire to.

But if White is convinced that because the words of Mark 9:44, 46 are found in verses 48, *“they were not **purposefully** omitted”* is he then implying that the Lord is only permitted to make any particular statement *once*?

If so, then why did the Lord through Noah effectively refer to Canaan as **“a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren”** three times Genesis 9:25-27? Why was it necessary to insert the phrase **“and Canaan shall be his servant”** in verses 26, 27, insofar as, in the words of none other than James White<sup>3 p 155</sup> *“the material in the verse occurs elsewhere”* i.e. in verse 25?

Why did the Lord require Israel's males to appear before Him "***three times in a year***" Exodus 23:17, Deuteronomy 16:16?

Why did Solomon "***offer burnt offerings and peace offerings...three times in a year***" 1 King 9:25?

Why did Elijah insist that "***four barrels of water***" be poured on "***the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood...a third time***" 1 Kings 18:31-35?

Why does the Psalmist refer to "***the land of Ham***" three times, Psalm 105:23, 27, 106:22?

Why does the Psalmist repeat the expression "***for his mercy endureth for ever***" in *all 26 verses* of Psalm 136?

Why did the Lord command, "***let the sword be doubled the third time, the sword of the slain***" in wreaking vengeance upon Israel, Ezekiel 21:14?

Why did Daniel pray "***three times a day***" Daniel 6:10?

Why did Jesus appear separately to the disciples *three* times and deem it necessary to challenge Peter about his love for the Lord for each of the *three* times that Peter had denied Him, Matthew 26:34, 75, John 21:15-17?

Why did Peter receive the vision of "***a certain vessel descending...three times,***" Acts 10:11, 16, 11:20?

Why did the Lord wait until Paul had "***besought the Lord thrice***" about his infirmity before answering his prayer, 2 Corinthians 12:8, 9?

Why did Paul undertake *three* visits to the Corinthian Church, 2 Corinthians 12:14, 13:1?

And why does the Lord insist on inserting the expressions "***precept upon precept***" and "***line upon line***" four times in Isaiah 28:10, 13? Could repetition be a valuable means of learning?

And why does the Lord insist on using the expression "***a little while***" *four* times in John 16:16-19, making a total of *seven* times in which the expression occurs in the passage? If he wished to be 'consistent,' shouldn't James White insist that at least five of the occurrences of such a simple phrase be "***rightly removed from the text as not being part of what [John] originally wrote***"?

And why does the New Testament contain *four* Gospel accounts, instead of only one?

White does not address such questions but they give the lie to his 'once is sufficient' assumption about the expression "***Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.***"

The Lord Jesus Christ clearly did not consider that 'once is sufficient' for such a sobering declaration. Neither should the bible believer.

White might argue that the scriptures cited above are not in dispute because, supposedly, "***no textual variants***" exist but White's humanistic approach to the preservation of scripture invalidates this argument. See remarks in **Chapter 5**.

It should be remembered that modern translators have shown their tendency to obscure the doctrine of hell by repeatedly resorting to transliterations, such as *hades* or *sheol*. See remarks in **Chapter 6**, especially those of Dr Mrs Riplinger. To weaken the doctrine of hell even further by direct removal of verses that explicitly address it would be an obvious tactic for early bible corrupters.

See also Cloud's statement<sup>6 Part 3</sup> in **Chapter 3**.

*"The Lord Jesus Christ often emphasized His statements with the double phrase, "Verily, verily." In the book of Ezekiel the phrase "they shall know that I am the Lord" is repeated 106 times. The Bible is literally filled with this type of repetition. Does that mean the repetitious details are not important? Hardly! Yet that is precisely what the modern version defenders tell us. For example, in Mark 9, the Received Text and the King James Bible repeat "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" three times (verses 44, 46, 48). In the United Bible Societies Greek text and in the modern English versions, this statement is omitted from two of those places. It is in verse 48 but verses 44 and 46 are removed. Is this of no consequence? I believe a sermon in which the unspeakably horrible eternal nature of hell is mentioned three times is more potent than one in which it is mentioned only once."*

Dr Ruckman states<sup>18 p 122-3</sup>, his emphases, "Mark 9:44...The Greek text of W & H (and Nestle's) omits...**"Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."** As a matter of fact, the Greek philosophers and scholars found this verse so objectionable that they erased it **again, in Mark 9:46...**

*"The scholars seem to have forgotten that the source of the quotation is the last chapter of Isaiah.*

*"The context of Isaiah 66:24 is the "new heavens and new earth" (Isaiah 66:22).*

*"In view of the fact that the Bible has 66 books (with a division between 39 and 40), and Isaiah has 66 chapters (with a division between 39 and 40), and the end of the Bible and the end of Isaiah deal with the New Heavens and Earth, why would not Jesus emphasise the "unquenchable fire" and the "undying worm"? If the book of Isaiah ends on a negative note (Isa. 66:24) to sinners under the law, and Jesus comes, "made under the law," to warn the nation of Israel (Mal. 4:6), why would He mention Isaiah 66:24 only **once** in its complete statements? Isn't this an **under-emphasis**? Would God be guilty of emphasizing the wrong thing and under-emphasizing the right thing, as the gnat-strainers of textual criticism do?*

*"No, the English text is correct as it stands in A, D, K, X, Theta, Pi, and the majority of Receptus Greek manuscripts."*

White now maintains that Mark 7:16 should be excised from the Gospel of Mark because, in another bald statement, totally devoid of substantiation, he declares that although the verse is omitted by only "a rather small number of ancient manuscripts," 5 in all plus two unspecified early translations<sup>3 p 189</sup>, nevertheless "the passage is derived from Mark 4:9 and 23...[and] it is much easier to understand how the passage would be inserted elsewhere when appropriate than to understand why it would be deleted in the important ancient witnesses...since the material in the verse appears elsewhere in all the Greek manuscripts."

*"The important ancient witnesses" are principally Aleph and B, Sinaiticus and Codex L, according to Burgon<sup>8 p 67</sup>, "a solitary MS of the 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> century which exhibits an exceedingly vicious text." See the detailed material in **Chapter 3**, summarising the corrupt and untrustworthy nature of White's 'principal witnesses.'*

Tatian's Diatessaron<sup>8 p 64-5</sup> and the Gothic Version of Ulfilas contain Mark 7:16 as it stands in the AV1611. The Diatessaron dates from 180 AD and Ulfilas's Gothic Bible dates from 320 AD, i.e. almost contemporaneous with Aleph and B. The pre-700 AD Anglo Saxon Bible also supports the AV1611 in Mark 7:16. See **Appendix, Table A16**.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p 671</sup> all have Mark 7:16.

The modern Greek editors are not united in their rejection of Mark 7:16. Only Tischendorf<sup>62</sup> unequivocally omits the verse, later followed by Nestle, although again without altering the verse numbering sequence. Tregelles and Alford regard the verse as ‘doubtful.’ Tischendorf may have been swayed by White’s<sup>3 p 33</sup> “*great treasure*” i.e. Aleph.

It is therefore “*much easier*” – and entirely realistic – to treat White’s nebulous conjecture about Mark 7:16 with the contempt it deserves.

By sleight of hand, White tries to equate the modern corrupters of scripture with the King James translators with the statement that “*modern translations include such verses in brackets (NASB) or include the verse in a footnote (NIV)...the KJV translators included similar notes about verses being absent in certain manuscripts.*”

Luke 17:36 is such an example and White has attempted to impugn the authenticity of this verse before. See remarks in **Chapter 4** about the Textus Receptus and the chart from Dr Hills’s book<sup>65 p 220-3</sup> in support of Luke 17:36 in the AV1611. He even refers to this verse in the part of his book under discussion *but not in the immediate context cited above.*

The reason is that the verses in the AV1611 noted as “*being absent in certain manuscripts*” are found in *the Text* of the AV1611, *not in the margin* and appear in the Text *without brackets.*

Again White is mimicking his mentor in Genesis 3:1, “***Yea, hath God said?***”

White now lists several verses that, supposedly, are “*inserted text from other places in the Gospel accounts.*”

These include “*Matthew 17:21 (borrowed from Mark 9:29); Matthew 18:11 (from Luke 19:10); Matthew 23:14 (from Mark 12:40 and Luke 20:47); Mark 11:26 (from Matthew 6:15); Mark 15:28 (from Luke 22:37 or Isaiah 53:12); Luke 17:36 (from Matthew 24:40); and Luke 23:17 (from Matthew 27:15 or Mark 15:6).*

“*Borrowed*” by whom? Again, White is indulging in sheer conjecture. To repeat Burgon’s insightful assessment<sup>13 p xxvi</sup> Westcott and Hort’s dogma that mirrors White’s, “*It dispenses with proof. It furnishes no evidence. It asserts when it ought to argue. It reiterates when it is called on to explain...“I am sir Oracle.”*”

It is also noteworthy that, according to White, the errant scribes ‘borrowed’ from Mark and Luke for Matthew, Matthew and Luke for Mark and Matthew and Mark for Luke. But this cannot be. Any attempt to ‘harmonise’ the Gospels after the manner that White postulates, would have used Matthew as the standard throughout because it was the first of the Gospels to be written, according to early tradition<sup>116 p 458-9</sup>, i.e. closest to the actual events and therefore the most authentic account according to the notion<sup>3 p 156</sup> that ‘oldest is best.’

And if various verses were ‘borrowed’ from another Gospel, why was the wording changed and words omitted or added, if the ‘borrowed’ wording is in fact the ‘true scripture’? Is White also accusing the ‘borrowers’ of trying to conceal their purloining of the ‘true’ scriptures by so doing and liken them to the ungodly prophets of Jeremiah 23:30?

***“Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the LORD, that steal my words every one from his neighbour.”***

If so, why doesn’t White say so?

See remarks for Matthew 18:11 in *White's Introduction* and consider the following passages, with comments inserted as appropriate.

***"Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting"*** Matthew 17:21. Why did the 'borrower' omit ***"by nothing"***?

***"And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting"*** Mark 9:29.

***"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation"*** Matthew 23:14. Why did the 'borrower' insert ***"therefore"*** and change ***"these shall"*** or ***"the same shall"*** to ***"ye shall"***? White earlier makes much of a similar difference, between ***"ye"*** and ***"he"*** in Cambridge and Oxford Editions of the AV1611 for Jeremiah 34:16. See remarks at the end of *Chapter 4*. Why does he ignore the difference here?

***"Which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation"*** Mark 12:40.

***"Which devour widows' houses, and for a shew make long prayers: the same shall receive greater damnation"*** Luke 20:47.

Note that Matthew 23:14 is the most explicit of the three similar passages in condemning avaricious religious leaders, i.e. ***"Pharisees,"*** as ***"hypocrites!"*** Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 102</sup> has this penetrating observation, his emphases, that shows much more spiritual insight than White's bald speculations.

***"The direct context, written by the Holy Ghost, is a religious leader called "Father"...See Matthew 23:9..."***

***"Matthew 23:14...was omitted for the same reason Acts 8:37 was omitted – it was an offence to the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical system."***

***"But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses"*** Mark 11:26. Why did the 'borrower' insert ***"which is in heaven"***?

***"But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses"*** Matthew 6:15.

Didn't White notice that the context of Mark 11 was the Lord's entry into Jerusalem shortly before the crucifixion and the statement in verse 26 was made after the second cleansing of the temple, Mark 11:15-18, John 2:13-17, whereas the context of Matthew 6 was the Sermon on the Mount, approximately three years earlier? Why transfer words of scripture where the contexts don't match?

***"And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors"*** Mark 15:28.

***"For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end"*** Luke 22:37.

***"Herefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors"*** Isaiah 53:12.

Inspection of the above suggests that the 'borrower' borrowed from Mark 15:28 to insert into Luke 22:37, not the reverse as White maintains.

Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 110</sup> states, his emphases, that, “*The theory behind [the omission of Mark 15:28], in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, is that Luke copied from Mark (and someone else), and Matthew copied from Mark and someone else, and someone took Luke 22:37 out and stuck it back in Mark, after Mark was finished. (This Liberal theory is based on the idea that no two writers in the Bible can agree in wording unless they copied each other.)*”

“*The reading is found in the majority of Uncials and Cursives and it was deleted from Mark by someone who wanted to be a “Christian” without being “numbered with the transgressors.”*” Dr Ruckman refers the reader to Origen<sup>18 p 104-5</sup>. Origen was responsible for the omission of Mark 15:28 and for altering Matthew 19:17 into the “*stale crumb of Greek philosophy*” that reads, “*Why asketh thou me concerning the good*” because, Dr Ruckman’s emphasis, the statement “***There is none good but one: that is God!***” “*hurts the pride of an Alexandrian Greek Scholar who has castrated himself and gone barefoot to earn Heavenly merits!!*” See Dr Hills’s remarks<sup>65 p 143</sup> at the end of **Chapter 6**.

And the statement “*crucifies the pride of*” the modern translating committees. It does the same to James White<sup>3 p 254</sup>, as will be seen.

***“Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left”*** Luke 17:36.

***“Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left”*** Matthew 24:40.

Didn’t White notice that if Matthew 24:40 was to be ‘borrowed’ and ‘inserted’ in the Gospel of Luke, Luke 21 would be a more suitable passage than Luke 17 because Luke 21 matches the context of Matthew 24? Compare Matthew 24:1, 2 and Luke 21:5, 6.

***“(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast)*** Luke 23:17.

***“Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would”*** Matthew 27:15.

***“Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired”*** Mark 15:6.

It would be entirely reasonable to conclude with respect to Luke 23:17 that each of the Gospel writers recorded the same event in his own way, consistent with the words being “***given by inspiration of God***” 2 Timothy 3:16.

Inspection of the manuscript evidence<sup>8 p 61-2, 65-6, 9 p 68, 71, 82, 84, 93</sup> for and against the verses that White disputes shows that Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14, Mark 11:26, 15:28 are not only overwhelmingly supported by the available evidence but have ancient witnesses in the form of the Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac. The evidence against them consists of only a small number of manuscripts invariably headed up by the disreputable sources of Aleph and B, i.e. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus and including the untrustworthy Codex L – see comments above - for Matthew 18:11, 23:14 and Mark 11:26.

Matthew 17:21, 18:11 in the AV1611 have support from the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible. See **Appendix, Table A16**. Dr Holland<sup>55 p 55-6</sup> refers to “*The Three Cappadocian Fathers...Basil of Caesarea (329-379 AD), Gregory of Nazianzus (330-389 AD), and Gregory of Nyssa (330-395 AD)*” and states that they each quoted Matthew 17:21, thus adding further ancient support for the verse as it stands in the AV1611.

Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 22, 30, 33-4, 40</sup> lists more ancient support for Matthew 17:21 from the citations of Pseudo-Clement of Rome, dated approximately 270 AD, Origen (185-254 AD) and Ambrose of Milan (339-397 AD).

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p718, 724</sup> all have Matthew 17:21, 18:11.

Luke 17:36 is one of the AV1611 verses with only ‘minority’ support but the verse is found<sup>8 p 71, 11 p 49</sup> in the Old Latin, the Peshitta Syriac and in Tatian, 172 AD. In the words of White, these are “*important ancient witnesses*” and it is therefore erroneous of him to suppose that the verse was somehow ‘inserted’ into later manuscripts. See **Chapter 4**.

The pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible has Luke 17:36, as in the AV1611. See **Appendix, Table A16**. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p 741</sup> all contain Luke 17:36 though Tyndale<sup>47</sup> omits the verse.

The RV and Nestle join with White in getting rid of Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14, Mark 11:26, 15:28 and Luke 17:36.

Luke 23:17 has majority support<sup>62</sup> and was removed from the modern Greek texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles, with Lachmann and Alford regarding it as ‘doubtful.’ Westcott and Hort’s RV and Nestle also omit Luke 23:17.

Which are good reasons for retaining the verse as it stands in the AV1611. Luke 23:17 is found in the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible. See **Appendix, Table A16**.

White’s assertion that “*it is much easier to understand how the passage would be inserted elsewhere when appropriate than to understand why it would be deleted in the important ancient witnesses*” is aimed specifically at Mark 7:16 – see above – but it expresses his notion that all deletions in the modern versions are actually later additions to the ‘original’ text.

White professes<sup>3 p 91</sup> to regard Dean Burgon as a among the “*true scholars of the first rank*.” See remarks under **White’s Introduction**.

Dean Burgon<sup>131 p 128-131</sup> states the following from his book, *The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, about which White has no comment, naturally.

*“We have now to consider the largest of all classes of corrupt variations from the genuine Text, — the omission of words and clauses and sentences...”*

*“The question will now be asked by an intelligent reader, ‘If such is the balance of evidence, how is it that learned critics still doubt the genuineness of those verses?’*

*“To this question there can be but one answer, viz. ‘Because those critics are blinded by invincible prejudice in favour of two unsafe guides [Aleph and B], and on behalf of Omission’ [like White].*

*“We have already seen enough of the character of those guides, and are now anxious to learn what there can be in omissions which render them so acceptable to minds of the present day. And we can imagine nothing except the halo which has gathered round the detection of spurious passages in modern times, and has extended to a supposed detection of passages which in fact are not spurious. Some people appear to feel delight if they can prove any charge against people who claim to be orthodox; others without any such feeling delight in superior criticism; and the flavour of scepticism especially commends itself to the taste of many. To the votaries of such criticism, omissions of passages which they style ‘interpolations,’ [as White does throughout his Chapter 7] offer temptingly spacious hunting-fields.*

*“Yet the experience of copyists would pronounce that Omission is the besetting fault of transcribers. It is so easy under the influence of the desire of accomplishing a task, or at least of anxiety for making progress, to pass over a word, a line, or even more lines than*

one. As has been explained before, the eye readily moves from one ending to a similar ending with a surprising tendency to pursue the course which would lighten labour instead of increasing it. The cumulative result of such abridgement by omission on the part of successive scribes may be easily imagined, and in fact is just what is presented in Codex B. Dr. Dobbin has calculated 330 omissions in St. Matthew, 365 in St. Mark, 439 in St. Luke, 357 in St. John, 384 in the Acts, and 681 in the Epistles—2,556 in all as far as Heb. ix. 14, where it terminates, *Dublin University Magazine*, 1859, p. 620.

“Besides these considerations, the passages which are omitted, and which we claim to be genuine, bear in themselves the character belonging to the rest of the Gospels, indeed — in Dr. Hort’s expressive phrase — ‘have the true ring of genuineness.’

“But beyond all, — and this is the real source and ground of attestation, — they enjoy superior evidence from copies, generally beyond comparison with the opposing testimony, from Versions, and from Fathers.”

“The fact seems to be all but overlooked that a very much larger amount of proof than usual is required at the hands of those who would persuade us to cancel words which have been hitherto by all persons, — in all ages, — in all countries, — regarded as inspired Scripture. They have (1) to account for the fact of those words’ existence: and next (2), to demonstrate that they have no right to their place in the sacred page. The discovery that from a few copies they are away, clearly has very little to do with the question. We may be able to account for the omission from those few copies: and the instant we have done this, the negative evidence — the argument *e silentio* — has been effectually disposed of. A very different task — a far graver responsibility — is imposed upon the adverse party, as may be easily shewn. They must establish many modes of accounting for many classes and groups of evidence. Broad and sweeping measures are now out of date. The burden of proof lies with them.”

It still does, more than a century later. Nowhere does White lift it. Nor do any of his cronies.

Burgon has additional comment<sup>13 p 92-3, 131 p 75-8</sup>, his emphases, on some of the verses that White so confidently rejects. Since the time that Burgon wrote, a few additional manuscripts have been discovered omitting these verses, as Moorman indicates but Burgon’s thesis holds, nevertheless.

“Thus, the precious verse (S. Matthew xvii. 21) which declares that ‘this kind [of evil spirit] goeth not out but by prayer and fasting,’ is expunged by our Revisionists [and James White]; although it is vouched for by every known uncial **but two** (B 8), every known cursive **but one** (Evan. 33); is witnessed to by the Old Latin and the Vulgate, - the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopic, and Slavonic versions; by Origen, - Athanasius, - Basil, Chrysostom, - the Opus imperf., - the Syrian Clement, and John Damascene; - by Tertullian, - Ambrose, - Hilary, - Juvenius, - Augustine, - Maximus Taur., - and by the Syriac version of the Canons of Eusebius: above all by the Universal East, - having been read in all the churches of Oriental Christendom on the 10<sup>th</sup> Sunday after Pentecost, from the earliest period. Why, in the word, then (our readers will ask) have the Revisionists left those words out?...For no other reason, we answer, but because Drs Westcott and Hort [and James White] place them among the interpolations which they consider unworthy of being even ‘exceptionally retained in association with the true Text.’ ‘Western and Syrian’ is their oracular sentence [furnishing no proof].

“The blessed declaration, ‘The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost,’ — has in like manner been expunged by our Revisionists [and James White] from Matthew xviii.



11; although it is attested by every known uncial except B & L, and every known cursive **except three**: by the Old Latin and the Vulgate: by the Peschito, Cureton's and the Philoxenian Syriac: by the Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Georgian and Slavonic versions: - by Origen, - Theodorus Heracl., - Chrysostom – and Jovius the monk; by Tertullian, - Ambrose, - Hilary, - Jerome, - pope Damasus – and Augustine: - above all, by the Universal Eastern Church, for it has been read in all assemblies of the faithful on the morning of Pentecost, from the beginning. Why then (the reader will again ask) have the Revisionists expunged this verse? We can only answer as before, - because Drs Westcott and Hort...class it as among the 'Rejected Readings' of the most hopeless type. As before, **all** their sentence is 'Western and Syrian.' They add [as White does], 'Interpolated either from Luke xix. 10, or from an independent source, written or oral'.... Will the English Church suffer herself to be in this way defrauded of her priceless inheritance, - through the irreverent bungling of well-intentioned, but utterly misguided men?"

She did. See comments in **Chapter 3** about current Anglican apostasy, including dialogue with the Roman antichrist and appointment of female and openly sodomite bishops.

Burgon continues, with respect to Mark 15:28, from *The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, his emphasis.

"Take another instance. St. Mark xv. 28 has been hitherto read in all Churches as follows 'And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, "And He was numbered with the transgressors."' In these last days however the discovery is announced that every word of this is an unauthorized addition to the inspired text. Griesbach indeed only marks the verse as probably spurious; while Tregelles is content to enclose it in brackets. But Alford, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers eject the words...from the text altogether. What can be the reason for so extraordinary a proceeding?"

"Let us not be told by Schulz (Griesbach's latest editor) that 'the quotation is not in Mark's manner; that the formula which introduces it is John's: and that it seems to be a gloss taken from Luke xxii. 37.' This is not criticism but dictation, — imagination, not argument. Men who so write forget that they are assuming the very point which they are called upon to prove [circular reasoning, in which White<sup>3 p 155</sup> has indulged for all these so-called 'later insertions'].

"Now it happens that all the Uncials but six and an immense majority of the Cursive copies contain the words before us:— that besides these, the Old Latin, the Syriac, the Vulgate, the Gothic and the Bohairic versions, all concur in exhibiting them:— that the same words are expressly recognized by the Sectional System of Eusebius;— having a section (σις/η i.e. 216/8) to themselves — which is the weightiest sanction that Father had it in his power to give to words of Scripture. So are they also recognized by the Syriac sectional system (260/8), which is diverse from that of Eusebius and independent of it. What then is to be set against such a weight of ancient evidence? The fact that the following six Codexes are without this 28<sup>th</sup> verse, ⲁBCDX, together with the Sahidic and Lewis [a Syriac version<sup>131 p 43</sup>]. The notorious Codex k (Bobiensis) is the only other ancient testimony producible; to which Tischendorf adds 'about forty-five cursive copies.' Will it be seriously pretended that this evidence for omitting ver. 28 from St. Mark's Gospel can compete with the evidence for retaining it? [White makes such a pretence.]

"Let it not be once more insinuated that we set numbers before antiquity. Codex D is of the sixth century; Cod. X not older than the ninth: and not one of the four Codexes which remain is so old, within perhaps two centuries, as either the Old Latin or the Peshitto versions. We have Eusebius and Jerome's Vulgate as witnesses on the same side, besides

*the Gothic version, which represents a Codex probably as old as either. To these witnesses must be added Victor of Antioch, who commented on St. Mark's Gospel before either A or C were written...*

*"It will be not unreasonably asked by those who have learned to regard whatever is found in B or  $\aleph$  as oracular [to be taken on trust without evidence], — 'But is it credible that on a point like this such authorities as  $\aleph$ ABCD should all be in error?'"*

*"It is not only credible, I answer, but a circumstance of which we meet with so many undeniable examples that it ceases to be even a matter of surprise. On the other hand, what is to be thought of the credibility that on a point like this all the ancient versions (except the Sahidic) should have conspired to mislead mankind? And further, on what intelligible principle is the consent of all the other uncials, and the whole mass of cursives, to be explained, if this verse of Scripture be indeed spurious?"*

*I know that the rejoinder will be as follows:— 'Yes, but if the ten [Greek] words in dispute really are part of the inspired verity, how is their absence from the earliest Codexes to be accounted for?' Now it happens that for once I am able to assign the reason. But I do so under protest, for I insist that to point out the source of the mistakes in our oldest Codexes is no part of a critic's business. It would not only prove an endless, but also a hopeless task. This time, however, I am able to explain.*

*"If the reader will take the trouble to inquire at the Bibliotheque at Paris for a Greek Codex numbered '71,' an Evangelium will be put into his hands which differs from any that I ever met with in giving singularly minute and full rubrical directions. At the end of St. Mark xv. 27, he will read as follows:— 'When thou redest the sixth Gospel of the Passion, — also when thou redest the second Gospel of the Vigil of Good Friday, — stop here: skip verse 28: then go on at verse 29.' The inference from this is so obvious, that it would be to abuse the reader's patience if I were to enlarge upon it, or even to draw it out in detail. Very ancient indeed must the Lectionary practice in this particular have been that it should leave so fatal a trace of its operation in our four oldest Codexes: but **it has left it...**The explanation is evident, the verse is plainly genuine, and the Codexes which leave it out are corrupt.*

*"One word about the evidence of the cursive copies on this occasion. Tischendorf says that 'about forty-five' of them are without this precious verse of Scripture. I venture to say that the learned critic would be puzzled to produce forty-five copies of the Gospels in which this verse has no place. But in fact his very next statement (viz. that about half of these are Lectionaries), — satisfactorily explains the matter. Just so. From every Lectionary in the world, for the reason already assigned, these words are away; as well as in every MS. which, like B and  $\aleph$ , has been depraved by the influence of the Lectionary practice.*

*"And now I venture to ask, — What is to be thought of that Revision of our Authorized Version which omits ver. 28 altogether; with a marginal intimation that 'many ancient authorities insert it'? Would it not have been the course of ordinary reverence, — I was going to say of truth and fairness, — to leave the text unmolested: with a marginal memorandum that just 'a very few ancient authorities leave it out'?"*

Yes, although White does not go to this depth of research.

Pickering<sup>129</sup> p 82-3, citing Colwell, has these observations with respect to omissions, from an evaluation of papyri manuscripts, P45, P66 and P75, his emphases.

*“That P75 copied letters one by one is shown in the pattern of the errors. He has more than sixty readings that involve a single letter, and not more than ten careless readings that involve a syllable. But P66 drops sixty-one syllables (twenty-three of them in “leaps”) and omits as well a dozen articles and thirty short words. In P45 there is not one omission of a syllable in a “leap” nor is there any list of “careless” omissions of syllables. P45 omits words and phrases.*

*“As an editor the scribe of P45 wielded a sharp axe. The most striking aspect of his style is its conciseness. The dispensable word is dispensed with. He omits adverbs, adjectives, nouns, participles, verbs, personal pronouns — without any compensating habit of addition. He frequently omits phrases and clauses. He prefers the simple to the compound word. In short, he favors brevity. He shortens the text in at least fifty places in **singular readings alone**. But he does **not** drop syllables or letters. His shortened text is readable.*

*“Enough of these have been cited to make the point that P66 editorializes as he does everything else — in a sloppy fashion. He is not guided in his changes by some clearly defined goal which is always kept in view. If he has an inclination toward omission, it is not “according to knowledge,” but is whimsical and careless, often leading to nothing but nonsense.*

*“P66 has 54 leaps forward, and 22 backward; 18 of the forward leaps are haplography [the mistake of writing once what should have been written twice – like White with respect to Mark 9:44, 46, 48].*

*“P75 has 27 leaps forward, and 10 backward.*

*“P45 has 16 leaps forward, and 2 backward.*

*“From this it is clear that the scribe looking for his lost place looked ahead three times as often as he looked back. In other words, the loss of position usually resulted in a loss of text, an omission.*

*“The tables have been turned. Here is a clear statistical demonstration that interpolations are **not** “many times more numerous” than omissions. Omission is more common as an unintentional error than addition, and P45 shows that with some scribes omissions were **deliberate** and extensive. Is it mere coincidence that Aleph and B were probably made in the same area as P45 and exhibit similar characteristics? In any case, the “fullness” of the Traditional Text, rather than a proof of inferiority [as White asserts<sup>3 p 43, 45</sup>], emerges as a point in its favor.”*

That is, White’s preferred manuscripts suffer from the same mutilations as the papyri do. White’s great codices<sup>3 p 33</sup> do not represent “a more “concise”” text<sup>3 p 43, 45</sup>. They represent a *corrupt* text.

White includes Pickering’s book in his bibliography<sup>3 p 275</sup> but doesn’t discuss any aspects of it, which is not surprising. White does not discuss either of Burgon’s books, on the causes of corruption in the Traditional Text and the arbitrary deletions of the Revisers at all, which again is not surprising. Burgon and Pickering between them explode White’s central thesis as set out in this chapter. They prove that the scribes of the manuscripts underlying the modern versions that White prefers, NASV, NIV *did* omit parts of the word of God and that the scribes of the manuscripts underlying the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible *did not* ‘add to the word of God.’

See also Dr Ruckman’s summary<sup>1 p 107ff</sup>.

White now aims to excise John 5:4 from the Holy Bible, on the grounds that “*this verse provides a classic example of how a marginal note explaining something in the text can end up as part of the text somewhere down the line.*”

In characteristic fashion, White provides no evidence for the verse ever having been “*a marginal note*” and, in spite of “*research into the earliest forms of the New Testament,*” he can give no indication of how and when this supposed “*marginal note*” ever became “*part of the text*” except that it was “*somewhere down the line*” (whether time line or manuscript line is intended is unclear) or who was responsible for the transfer of the note into the text.

He notes<sup>3 p 189</sup> only that “*the verse...has many, many textual variants in the manuscripts [none specified]...[and] other manuscripts [none specified] place asterisks around the verse, indicating that the scribe who copied that manuscript realized that the verse was not present in all manuscripts available to him.*”

He adds, “*the verse is not present in the two oldest manuscripts of John, P66 and P75.*”

It should be remembered that although they support the underlying Greek text of the AV1611 as much if not more than they do that of the modern versions, P66 and P75 are *poor* manuscripts<sup>8 p 129-134</sup>. The absence of the verse from these manuscripts is therefore indicative of the kind of omission that Colwell has described. See Pickering above.

But White also uses this verse to impugn<sup>3 p 156</sup> bible believers yet again, his emphases. “*We wish only what was inspired by the Holy Spirit, without deletion, and without addition, either...Any examination of [KJV Only] writings will find the consistent use of terms like “omitted,” “deleted,” and “removed”...There is no effort to determine the original text because the KJV is assumed to be the standard by which all others are to be judged. This involves, again, circular reasoning on the part of the KJV Only group.*”

White’s “*circular reasoning*” is manifest throughout his book, i.e. ‘the KJV has errors in it, why, because some scholars say so, and why do some scholars say so, because the KJV has got errors in it.’ See remarks at the end of *White’s Introduction*.

Contrary to White’s ‘assumption,’ the AV1611 is not “*assumed to be the standard.*” It is vindicated as “*the standard*” when judged and found to be without blemish against the manifold criticisms levelled at it by generations of bible subversives like Westcott, Hort and White, “*by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of*” 2 Peter 1:2.

And is.

John 5:4 has overwhelming support for its authenticity<sup>8 p 73-4, 9 p 102</sup>, including ancient sources. See also remarks at the end of *Chapter 3*. This author’s earlier work provides a summary as follows, with updated references.

“*Verse 4 is omitted by Papyri 66, 75, uncials Aleph, B, C original, D, W supp, 0125, 0141, cursive 33, Old Latin d, f, l, q, Curetonian Syriac, some manuscripts of the Coptic–Sahidic–Bohairic versions, the Georgian and Latin Vulgate versions. Verse 4 is found (with variations) in uncials A, C3, K, L, Pi, X comm, Delta, Theta, Psi, 047, 063, 078, cursives 28, 565, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1253, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148, 2174, Byzantine majority text and Lectionaries, Old Latin a (4th century), aur (7<sup>th</sup>), b (5<sup>th</sup>), c (12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup>), e (5<sup>th</sup>), ff2 (5<sup>th</sup>), j (6<sup>th</sup>), r1 (7<sup>th</sup>), the Syriac (Harkelian, Peshitta, Philoxenian, 3<sup>rd</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> centuries), some manuscripts of the Coptic–Bohairic, the Armenian version; Diatessaron a, e arm, i, n; Tertullian (220 AD), Ambrose (397 AD), Didymus (398 AD), Chrysostom (407 AD), Cyril (444 AD)...*”

“Ruckman<sup>18 p 217</sup> and Hills<sup>65 p 146, 110 p 122</sup> state that the passage is virtually intact in the vast majority of Greek manuscripts. See Fuller<sup>64 p 157-158</sup>.”

Dr Moorman states that, “Verse 7 pre-supposes a miraculous moving of the water. Tertullian (c. 200) refers to the passage and Tatian (c. 175) placed it in his Diatessaron.” Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 217</sup> adds that over 200 Syrian manuscripts of the Diatessaron (2<sup>nd</sup> century) contain the passage, dating from 160-180 AD and the Trinitarian Bible Society publication<sup>66</sup> notes that “The copy quoted by Tertullian was certainly written more than a hundred years earlier than the Codex Vaticanus (B), and possibly even before either of the two papyrus fragments which omit the words.” See comments on this passage at the end of **Chapter 3**.

White maintains that “many, many textual variants” exist for the verse. The Trinitarian Bible Society publication<sup>66</sup> refers simply to “some variation.”

Nevertheless, the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible supports the AV1611 in John 5:4. See **Appendix, Table A16**. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p 729</sup> all have John 5:4 in agreement with the AV1611.

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 154</sup> notes that, “If we are to accept a reading based on its wide geographical distribution, we should accept this reading because it has old textual support with the greatest amount of geographical distribution. It is found in codices A, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, Δ, Θ, Π...The Greek miniscules overwhelmingly support the verse...in 28, 565, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1253, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, and 2148. It is also included in the majority of Old Latin manuscripts and early translations.”

Dr Holland cites the Old Syriac Peshitta as containing the verse (although some Peshitta manuscripts don’t – see Burgon’s comments below) and adds that, “The passage also has patristic citations. It is found in the Diatessaron of the second century, Tertullian (200 AD)...Ambrose (397 AD), Didymus (398 AD), Chrysostom (407 AD) and Cyril (444 AD), demonstrating that both Greek and Latin fathers accepted the reading as genuine.”

Dr Hills<sup>65 p 145-6</sup> defends John 5:4 as found in the AV1611 and addresses the variations in the text that White uses to cast doubt on the verse. See in particular Dr Hills’s last paragraph.

“The words “waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had” (vss. 3b-4) are omitted by Papyri 66 and 75, Aleph B C, a few minuscules, the Curetonian Syriac, the Sahidic, the Bodmer Bohairic, and a few Old Latin manuscripts. This disputed reading, however, has been defended not only by conservatives such as Hengstenberg (1861) but also by radicals such as A. Hilgenfeld (1875) (14) and R. Steck (1893). Hengstenberg contends that “the words are necessarily required by the connection,” quoting with approval the remark of von Hofmann (an earlier commentator) that it is highly improbable “that the narrator, who has stated the site of the pool and the number of the porches, should be so sparing of his words precisely with regard to that which it is necessary to know in order to understand the occurrence, and should leave the character of the pool and its healing virtue to be guessed from the complaint of the sick man, which presupposes a knowledge of it.” Hilgenfeld and Steck also rightly insist that the account of the descent of the angel into the pool in verse 4 is presupposed in the reply which the impotent man makes to Jesus in verse 7.

*“Certain of the Church Fathers attached great importance to this reference to the angel’s descent into the pool (John 5:3b-4), attributing to it the highest theological significance. The pool they regarded as a type of baptism and the angel as the precursor of the Holy Spirit. Such was the interpretation which Tertullian (c. 200) gave to this passage. “Having been washed,” he writes, “in the water by the angel, we are prepared for the Holy Spirit.” Similarly, Didymus (c 379) states that the pool was “confessedly an image of baptism” and the angel troubling the water “a forerunner of the Holy Spirit.” And the remarks of Chrysostom (c. 390) are to the same effect. These writers, at least, appear firmly convinced that John 5:3b-4 was a genuine portion of the New Testament text. And the fact that Tatian (c. 175) included this reading in his Diatessaron also strengthens the evidence for its genuineness by attesting its antiquity.*

*“Thus both internal and external evidence favor the authenticity of the allusion to the angel’s descent into the pool. Hilgenfeld and Steck suggest a very good explanation for the absence of this reading from the documents mentioned above as omitting it. These scholars point out that there was evidently some discussion in the Church during the 2<sup>nd</sup> century concerning the existence of this miracle working pool. Certain early Christians seem to have been disturbed over the fact that such a pool was no longer to be found at Jerusalem...and so various attempts were made to remove the difficulty through conjectural emendation [uninformed guesswork]. In addition to those documents which omit the whole reading there are others which merely mark it for omission with asterisks and obels. Some scribes, such as those that produced A and L, omitted John 5:3b, waiting for the moving of the water, but did not have the courage to omit John 5:4...Other scribes, like those that copied out D and W omitted John 5:4 but did not see the necessity of omitting John 5:3b. A and L and about 30 other manuscripts add the genitive “of the Lord” after “angel,” and various other small variations were introduced. That the whole passage has been tampered with by rationalistic scribes is shown by the various spellings of the name of the pool, Bethesda, Bethsaida, Bethzatha, etc. In spite of this, however, John 5:3b-4 has been preserved virtually intact in the vast majority of the Greek manuscripts (Traditional Text).”*

John Burgon writes<sup>13 p 283, 131 p 264</sup>, his emphasis, *“The troubling of the pool of Bethesda (S. John v. 3, 4) is not even allowed a bracketed place in Dr Hort’s Text. How the accomplished Critic would have set about persuading the Ante-Nicene Fathers that they were in error for holding it to be genuine Scripture, it is hard to imagine.*

*“Concerning St. John v. 3, 4: to which there really attaches no manner of doubt, as I have elsewhere shewn (in an unpublished paper). Thirty-two precious words in that place are indeed omitted by  $\aleph$ BC: twenty-seven by D. But by this time the reader knows what degree of importance is to be attached to such an amount of evidence [James White doesn’t]. On the other hand, they are found in **all other copies**: are vouched for by the Syriac (It is omitted in some MSS. of the Peshitto) and the Latin versions: in the Apostolic Constitutions, by Chrysostom, Cyril, Didymus, and Ammonius, among the Greeks, — by Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine among the Latins. Why a passage so attested is to be assumed to be an after-thought of the Evangelist has never yet been explained: no, nor ever will be.”*

James White has not provided a satisfactory explanation.

Bishop J. C. Ryle comments<sup>66</sup> on John 5:3b, 4, *““To condemn the passage as not genuine is a lazy way of cutting the knot, and not at all warranted by the majority of the manuscripts...Here as in many other instances, the simplest view, and the one which involves the fewest difficulties, is to take the passage as we find it, and to interpret it as*

*narrating an actual fact – a standing miracle which actually was literally wrought at a certain season and perhaps every year.*

*“After all, there is no real difficulty in the passage before us, than in the history of our Lord’s temptation in the wilderness, the various cases of Satanic possession, or the release of Peter from prison by an angel. Once admit the existence of angels, their ministry on earth, and the possibility of their interposition to carry out God’s designs, and there is nothing that ought to stumble us in the passage. The true secret of some of the objections [e.g. White’s] is the modern tendency to regard all miracles as useless lumber, which must be thrown overboard, if possible, and cast out of the sacred narrative on every occasion. Against this tendency we must watch and be on our guard.”*”

And be on our guard to the present day. The Spirit of God gave John 5:3b, 4 **“by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16a, James White’s contrary opinion notwithstanding – and that of Griesbach, who regarded the passage as doubtful and those of Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford, who eliminated the passage from their texts.

White now presents another list of verses<sup>3 p 157-9</sup>, where *“phrases and words”* in those verses could, supposedly, *“make the “trip” from one Gospel to another and find a place even in a majority of the Greek texts.”*

He calls this transfer *“parallel influence”* and describes its occurrence as *“so prevalent”* in the Gospels as they read in the AV1611.

As usual, White supplies no historical evidence whatsoever of how this *“parallel influence”* was put into effect or by whom. Once again, he has resorted to sheer *“oracular”* conjecture. *“Parallel influence...caused a scribe, undoubtedly zealous for orthodox doctrine, to insert the term...so as to protect a sacred truth...Modern translations, far from seeking to denigrate such divine truths, are simply seeking to give us what was written by the original authors.”*

So why would *“a scribe, undoubtedly zealous for orthodox doctrine”* – and in time situated much closer to *“the original authors”* than the modern translators - wilfully take it upon himself to *add* to *“what was written by the original authors”*?

Wouldn’t the same scribe be keenly aware of the warnings in scripture?

***“Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar”*** Proverbs 30:5, 6.

***“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book”*** Revelation 22:18.

Evidently not, according to James White, in spite of the obvious ‘inconsistency.’

White’s list includes:

Matthew 1:25, where **“firstborn”** was supposedly imported from Luke 2:7,

Matthew 8:29, where **“Jesus”** has supposedly been imported from Mark 1:24,

Matthew 20:16, where **“many be called, but few chosen”** is assumed to have come from Matthew 22:14,

Matthew 25:13 where **“wherein the Son of man cometh”** was brought over from Matthew 24:44,

Matthew 27:35, where John 19:24 is supposed to have provided the phrase *“that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots,”*

Mark 6:11, where White reckons that the sentence *“Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city”* came over from Matthew 10:15, Mark 10:21, where the exhortation *“take up the cross”* is supposed to be an import from Mark 8:34.

And Colossians 1:14, where the words *“through his blood”* apparently migrated from Ephesians 1:7. See *Appendix, Table A1*.

Note again the erratic manner in which White supposes that Mark and Luke have been used to add to Matthew but Matthew has also been used to add to Mark. See remarks with respect to White’s other list above.

White’s excuse for these fabrications of *“parallel influence”* is as before, his emphases. *“In each instance where the NIV lacks a phrase in its text that is found in the KJV, that same material is found elsewhere in the NIV New Testament...if the NIV (or any other modern translation) is attempting to “hide” something, why include the very same material in another place? Such a translation procedure makes no sense at all...*

*“Matthew 1:25 is often cited by critics of modern translations as an attempt to destroy the virgin birth of Christ. Yet, if a modern translation wished to do this, why not remove the parallel occurrence of the term at Luke 2:7, where all the modern translations contain the disputed term?”*

Again – see remarks in *Chapter 4* - what of the Christian on the mission field who only possesses part of the New Testament? How does White make up for the deficiencies of the NIV versus the AV1611 New Testament?

White<sup>3 p 217-218</sup> has further comment on Matthew 1:25 in his Chapter 8, entitled *The Son of God, The Lord of Glory*. A summary of his additional statements is included here, his emphasis.

*“The parallel passage [for Matthew 1:25] is Luke 2:7, a very important passage that very early on had a central place in Christian liturgy. As such, the passage would naturally lend itself to influencing other passages, especially Matthew 1:25...As we noted earlier, Luke 2:7 has not been “tampered with” which...destroys the theories of conspiracy with reference to “heretics” somehow “changing” the manuscripts (why not remove **all** references to a doctrine you do not like, if you have your editorial scissors out anyway?) The modern translations all contain Luke 2:7, and all have the phrase “firstborn” right here in the text, a rather silly thing to do if, in fact, you are trying to hide a doctrine.”*

In answer to White’s questions above, see Cloud’s remarks<sup>6 Part 3</sup>, above and in *Chapter 3*. See also this author’s work<sup>8 p 99-100</sup>. White should also remember that modern translators of a ‘liberal’ persuasion have already made an attempt to weaken the testimony of Luke 2:7 by rendering Mary’s words in Luke 1:34 as *“I have no husband”* RSV – a direct attack on the virgin birth. And the AV1611’s explicit reading *“I know not a man”* eliminates any possibility of a ‘vestal’ virgin<sup>132 p 10</sup>, as is allowed for in the NASV, NIV, NRSV reading, *“I am a virgin.”*

So contrary to White’s complacent assumption, modern translators *are* working on removing, by subversion, *“the parallel occurrence of the term at Luke 2:7.”*



Evidence in support of the AV1611 reading “*firstborn*” is overwhelming<sup>8 p 56, 9 p 61</sup> and includes Taitan’s Diatessaron, some of the Old Latin copies and the Peshitta Syriac, all the texts of which pre-date Aleph and B, which are the main Greek sources that omit the word “*firstborn*.”

Matthew 1:25 as it stands in the AV1611 has support from the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible. See *Appendix, Table A16*. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p 717</sup> all have “*firstborn*” in Matthew 1:25 or “*first begotten*.”

The available evidence raises a further question. How did all these scribes, separated far and wide by time, space and language, somehow ‘conspire’ to create the kind of “*parallel influence*” about which White is so confident? White doesn’t address this question, let alone answer it.

Burgon has these further comments<sup>13 p 123-4</sup>, his emphases.

*“We read on till we reach ver. 25, where we encounter a statement which fairly trips us up: viz., - ‘And knew her not till she had brought forth a son.’ No intimation is afforded of what has been here effected; but in the meantime every one’s memory supplies the epithet (‘her first-born’) which has been ejected. Whether something very like indignation is not excited by the discovery that these important words have been surreptitiously withdrawn from their place, let others say. For ourselves, when we find that only 8 B Z and two cursives copies\* can be produced for the omission, we are at a loss to understand of what the Revisionists can have been dreaming.”*

\*Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 27-8, 59, 61</sup> indicates that the 18 Caesarean, or part-Alexandrian, manuscripts, Families 1, 13, support the omission. Families 1, 13 are noted for exhibiting appreciable levels of corruption although overall, they favour the AV1611 against the NIV in ratio 3:1 for the 356 doctrinal passages that Dr Moorman has examined. So considerable is the evidence in support of “*firstborn*” as it stands in the AV1611 that the deficiencies of Families, 1, 13 do not effect Burgon’s conclusions. Burgon goes on to describe the body of evidence in support of the AV1611 – see above - including “*eighteen Fathers in all*” and rightly asks.

*“And how is it possible, (we ask,) that two copies of the IVth century (B 8) and one of the VIth (z) – all three without a character – backed by a few copies of the old Latin, should be supposed to be any counterpoise at all for such an array of first-rate contemporary evidence as the foregoing?”*

White cannot answer. But note again Dr Ruckman’s remarks<sup>33 p 98-9</sup> about divergences between copies of the Old Latin. See *Chapter 4*. Emphases are his.

*“There are two types of Old Latin readings: European and African. The old European (Note: “Italy” – Itala) was the type Jerome (from ITALY) used to bring the Old Latin into line with the Pope (who was in ITALY). Any “Old Itala” would have been the right “Old Latin” BEFORE JEROME MESSED WITH IT, and consequently, any Old Latin would have been the right text in Africa before ORIGEN messed with it. Thus Jerome, Origen, and Augustine stand perpetually bound together as an eternal memorial to the depravity of Bible rejecting “Fundamentalists,” who enthrone their egos as the Holy Spirit.”*

Which observation strongly indicates that the only Old Latin copies that support the modern omissions that White approves are *corrupted* copies.

Dr Ruckman<sup>8 p 292-3, 18 p 94-5, 102-3</sup> notes that Codex D was used to eliminate Luke 24:12 from Nestle’s text – it is omitted from Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition – against the combined witness of P75, Aleph, A, B, C, Theta, the Old Latin and the Old Syriac. He states that D is

now *set aside* along with all the other many, varied and ancient witnesses to the AV1611 inclusion of **“firstborn”** in favour of Aleph and B, which support the omission because, his emphases, *“the word implies that Mary had other children after Jesus Christ (Mark 6:3), and Rome has always taught that Mary was a perpetual virgin...The “neutral text,” created by W & H, is, therefore, a text which removes verses on the Deity of Christ because they are “doctrinally suspect,” in line with Orthodoxy, and then turns right around and removes verses which are offensive to Rome, because they expose her false teachings.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 101-3</sup> states the following with respect to Matthew 1:25, his emphases. See also his remarks elsewhere<sup>18 p 102-103, 33, p 232-3, 141 p 12</sup>.

*“The word **“firstborn”** has been erased from Matthew 1:25 in the NIV and the NASV. This gives the Vatican a break. It occurs in the first chapter of the first book in the New Testament so Rome will be able to convince the sucker that Mary’s other children (Ps. 69:8; John 2:17), who are named in Mark 6:3-4, were **cousins**. It is  $\aleph$  and B who omit “firstborn” to confirm the **perpetual virginity of Mary**.*

*“A Scholarship Only advocate...says “Well, since the word “firstborn” can be found in Luke 2:7 it is alright to remove it from Matthew 1:25...This is the method by which White got rid of **“Jesus,” “Christ,” “God”** and **“Lord”** more than twenty times in the New Testament. He swore that since the foulest, most depraved, licentious Greek manuscripts on earth had **“God”** (or **“Christ”** or **“Jesus”** or **“Lord”**) SOMEWHERE in them, they could make as many mutilations as they could get away with **without getting caught**...*

*“The **“name above every name”** (Matt. 1:21) appears in the context of Matthew 1:25...The word **“Jesus”** is **not** found in the **context** of Luke 2:7. It does not appear until verse 21, and **then** it is not connected with **THE KING OF THE JEWS**, which is the **theme** of Matthew (Matt. 1:6, 21, 2:1-3, 5-6, 8). Someone wanted to make Mary a perpetual virgin in the **first chapter** of the New Testament, not the **forty-sixth chapter** (Luke 2). Note that Luke doesn’t mention **“KNEW HER NOT TILL...”** (Matt. 1:25). Jimmy lied to you. There was a real good reason for removing it from Matthew 1:25 and it is not found in Luke 2:7. In Matthew 1:25 is a statement indicating Joseph gave her **MORE CHILDREN**. It is not in Luke 2:7.*

*“Jimmy<sup>3 p 159</sup> cries out: “Matthew 1:25 is often cited by critics of modern translations as an attempt to deny the virgin birth of Christ.”*

*“It has never been cited for that purpose once. The verse is cited to show how someone tried to make Mary a **perpetual virgin**. What would Matthew 1:25 have to do with **the Virgin Birth**?...*

*“[White] intones: “Why not remove the parallel occurrence of the term at Luke 2:7 where all the modern translations contain the disputed term?” **They did**. The scribe of manuscript “W” removed it. White...**didn’t check his manuscripts**.”*

Unlike the use of Codex D to eliminate Luke 24:12, adoption of Codex W’s omission of **“firstborn”** in Luke 2:7 was clearly a step too far for the modern translators, who followed Codices  $\aleph$  and B, which retain **“firstborn”** in Luke 2:7. But the RSV weakened the testimony of Luke 2:7 by changing the wording of Luke 1:34. See above. When might another attempt be made to alter the scriptures again, in favour of Rome, like the elimination of **“firstborn”** in Matthew 1:25 by  $\aleph$  and B?

Bible believers should never forget the words of the NIV translators, who state in the Preface to their version, *“the work of translation is never wholly finished.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 127ff</sup> has these comments about White's "*parallel influence*," later termed<sup>3 p 253-4</sup> "*parallel corruption*," with respect to Matthew 8:29, his emphases.

*“Matthew 8:29 comes from Mark 1:24. Lied again...The clumsy, careless Alexandrian scribe...omitted “Jesus” on the grounds of eye trouble and sloppy, shallow scholarship...White’s comments<sup>3 p 253-4</sup> are simply Swampfire: “The phrase [“Jesus”] is most probably inserted from Luke 4:34 or Mark 1:34...Familiarity...led an early scribe of Matthew to insert the name of Jesus, though he did not go so far as to add “Nazarene,” a much less familiar term.” That is the dead Hort “in the flesh.” ABSOLUTE, PURE, HYPOTHETICAL CONJECTURE BASED ON THE IMAGINATION...but now you must pretend that while ADDING to the text (“Jesus”), the same anonymous scribe also subtracted from the text (“Nazareth”: Mark and Luke) i.e., **he didn’t borrow or subtract from either passage...***

*“Now I hate to get this technical for the average reader but if he is going to be “informed” about the NASV and NIV, he needs this information, which White deliberately withheld time, after time, after time. Note first of all, that White did NOT give you the real readings of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, although he **quoted** both of them. *Ⲱ* and *Ⲃ* were written in **Uncials**: block capital letters. White was afraid to print his own uncial manuscripts for they would have shown HOW the Alexandrian scribe (always obsessed with OMISSIONS) got screwed up...*

*“The foulest manuscripts in existence [Codices Sinaiticus Aleph and Vaticanus B] read KAICOIIYYIETOYΘY...*

*“The word for “Jesus” in Uncials is: IHCOY. This means that if you printed out the AV Textus Receptus in Uncials...You would see [with word separation]: KAI COI IHCOY YIE TOY ΘY [the phrase “with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God”].*

*“All a clumsy, sloppy, careless Scholarship Only advocate would have to do...would be to skip the H, C, O, in the name of Jesus Christ, thus joining an Iota [I] at the beginning of Christ’s name [IHCOY] with the Upsilon [Y] on the end of the name [IHCOY] and he would have...: KAICOIIYYIETOYΘY.*

*“The foulest Alexandrian corruptions in existence read: KAICOIIYYIETOYΘY.”*

This reading would appear to leave a redundant I...Y, iota...upsilon. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Nestlé, Aland, and Metzger didn’t dare print ANY text they used...Having already assimilated the first iota [of IHCOY for Jesus or *Ἰησοῦς* as the word appears in the cursive or lower case script of the Greek editions] into “*οσι*,” they simply skipped H, C, O. Eta, Sigma, and Omicron [and apparently assimilated Upsilon, Y, with YIE].”*

The apparent anomaly in Aleph and B shows distinctly when word separation is introduced. Note the emboldened letters.

*KAI COI **I** **Y** YIE TOY ΘY.*

If that is how Aleph and B read, then clearly, as Dr Ruckman has shown, the emboldened letters have to be assimilated with the fortuitously identical last and first letters of the words immediately adjacent to them, otherwise no coherent reading is possible – *unless the emboldened letters refer to a word i.e. IHCOY, Jesus, that has been omitted, inadvertently or otherwise.*

With the modern Greek editors, modern version editors and James White, it was definitely – and sinfully – otherwise. They then adopted the ‘assimilation’ strategy.

Dean Burgon<sup>64 p 67, 133 p 87</sup> observed a similar anomaly in his examination of Codex B, with respect to the omission of Mark 16:9-20, where he noted a blank space in the manuscript between its ending of Mark’s Gospel and the beginning of Luke’s Gospel, which he described as, his emphases, “*a blank space abundantly sufficient to contain the twelve verses which [the scribe] nevertheless withheld.*”

Dean Burgon states that “*It is the only vacant column in the whole manuscript*” and he concludes, “*By leaving room for the verses it omits, [Codex B] brings into prominent notice at the end of fifteen centuries and a half, a more ancient witness than itself. The venerable Author of the original Codex from which Codex B was copied, is thereby brought to view. And thus, our supposed adversary (Codex B) proves our most useful ally for it procures us the testimony of an hitherto unsuspected witness. The earlier scribe, I repeat, unmistakably comes forward at this stage of the inquiry, to explain that he at least is prepared to answer for the genuineness of these Twelve concluding Verses.*”

In the same way, the redundant letters **I Y** for Matthew 8:29 in Aleph and B testify to the genuineness of the AV1611 inclusion of “**Jesus**” from witnesses more ancient than themselves.

Dr Moorman cites in addition to the majority of Greek manuscripts, the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac in favour of “**Jesus**” in Matthew 8:29. The main Greek witnesses against “**Jesus**” are Aleph, B, L and C, although a corrector of C has inserted “**Jesus**” into this manuscript. Aleph and B, each “*a great codex*” according to White<sup>3 p 33, 251</sup> are witnesses found by Burgon to be “*without a character*” – see above – and Codex L has “*an exceedingly vicious text.*” See Burgon’s remarks on Mark 7:16 above and at the end of **Chapter 3**.

The pre-350 AD Gothic Bible and the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible support the AV1611 in Matthew 8:29. See **Appendix, Table A16**. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p 657</sup> all have “**Jesus**” in Matthew 8:29.

Turning to Matthew 20:16, supposedly modified by means of Matthew 22:14, again the question arises, why transfer words of scripture between two passages with different contexts? Moreover, the disputed words from Matthew 20:16, “*many be called, but few chosen,*” have overwhelming, ancient and widely varying testimony<sup>9 p 69</sup> to their authenticity, including the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac, pre-dating the main witnesses again the words, which once again are found to be the disreputable witnesses, Aleph, B, L, Z.

White is neither able to address the above question nor refute the body of testimony in support of the AV1611 reading.

The same question arises with respect to the words “*wherein the Son of man cometh*” in Matthew 25:13, assumed to have been transferred from Matthew 24:44, in reverse direction from the previous example and modified with the addition of the preposition “*wherein.*”

The haphazard nature of these transfers indicates that White is making up these examples as he goes along, to cover for the errant nature of the manuscripts underlying these modern omissions. However, even genuine scholars can fall prey to individual subjectivity, such as Burgon, with respect to Matthew 10:8<sup>8 p 136-7</sup>, where he thought “*raise the dead*” an insertion, Matthew 6:18<sup>131 p 172</sup>, where he thought the phrase “*which is in secret*” came

from verse 6, though apparently he accepted the remainder of the repetitions in verse 18 as genuine scripture and Matthew 25:13, 27:35<sup>131 p 172</sup>, where Burgon agrees with White.

On this occasion, the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac side with Aleph and B in supporting the omission<sup>9, p 72-3</sup>, although the majority of manuscripts – indicating a wide variety of witnesses – support the AV1611.

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 136-8</sup> makes these comments, his emphases.

*“Whitewash job: Matthew 25:13, was borrowed from Matthew 24:44 **“wherein the Son of man cometh”**...*

*“The Alexandrian dementia of “Scholarship Onlyism”...believes that no man (this time it is the Lord Jesus Christ) can say exactly the same thing TWICE in a discourse that runs fifteen minutes. (See Mark 9:44, 46 for example)...*

*“Matthew 25:13 and 24:44 are on the **same page** in the Vatican manuscript. I have a photostatic copy of Vaticanus [and Sinaiticus] right here on my desk.) Both of the verses are the last verse in the second and fourth columns of the uncial. Since the nuts in Alexandria (200-400) set the precedence for the nuts in Europe and America, (1800-1900) they certainly would have seen both readings **immediately**, and would have erased the second one on the same grounds that Nestle-Hort-White-Metzger-NIV-NASV etc., erased it: **A conjectural hypothesis based on a Fairy Tale.**”*

Dr Ruckman comments<sup>1 p 131-2</sup> as follows on Matthew 27:35, his emphases.

*“Whitewash job. Matthew 27:35 came from John 19:24.*

*“Careful, stupid. The incident of the piercing of the Redeemer’s side, mentioned in that same chapter (John 19:34), was transferred, in, to the **same chapter** mentioned in MATTHEW (Matthew 27:49)...the NASV committee made a marginal note of this ghastly **textual lie**, and said **“some early manuscripts add “and another took a spear and pierced His side and there came out blood and water”!** “Some” – **they are not listed**. Why weren’t they listed?*

*“Do you realize what you read? **ⲛ and B had the Roman soldier open Christ’s side with a spear BEFORE HE DIED.**”*

ⲛ and B are each “a great codex” according to James White<sup>3 p 251</sup>. Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition also contains the NASV’s footnote i.e. marginal note, with reference to “other ancient authorities” but without identifying them.

Dr Ruckman continues.

*“So the NASV didn’t dare print (not even in a **marginal note**), the truth of the matter. White doesn’t even dare mention **the note**. **That is the “quality” of the scholarship behind “The King James Only Controversy.”**”*

Dr Ruckman cites Dean Burgon<sup>133, p 80</sup> as follows, whom White<sup>3 p 91</sup> considers to be a scholar “of the first rank.”

*““There does not exist in the whole compass of the New Testament a more monstrous instance of this than is furnished by the transfer of the incident of the piercing of our Redeemer’s side from S. John xix. 24 to S. Matth. xxvii., in Cod. B and Cod. ⲛ, where it is introduced at the end of ver. 49 in defiance of reason as well as of authority.””*

Dr Ruckman continues, his emphases.

*“Right in this **very place** (where this monstrous “harmonization” took place) in B and 8, you are being told that Matthew 27:35 was borrowed from John 19:24! What is [White’s] evidence?...Why the evidence for White’s “borrowing” was the manuscript that said Jesus’ side was pierced **while He was alive!** (B and 8)...*

*“Nestlé...refuses to tell you **where he got HIS text from in Matthew 27:35.** No “text” appears at the end of his baloney sausage...”*

And he has this shrewd observation about White’s whole approach to the Holy Bible.

*“Have you noticed, by now, that White’s whole book is a negative approach to the truth? It is based on **omissions.** It is not based on Scriptural texts “or variants,” at all. “Variants” are **words, not blank spaces...**”*

Dr Ruckman cites Dean Burgon<sup>131 p 130</sup> as follows, Dr Ruckman’s emphases.

*““Learned critics...are blinded by invincible prejudice in favour of two unsafe guides, [B and 8] and on behalf of OMISSION.*

*““We have already seen enough of the character of those guides, and are now anxious to learn what there can be in OMISSIONS which render them so acceptable to minds of the present day [like White’s]. And we can imagine nothing except the halo which has gathered round the detection of spurious passages in modern times, and has extended to a SUPPOSED DETECTION of passages which in fact are NOT spurious.””*

White<sup>3 p 33</sup> has attempted to exonerate himself from an over zealous reliance on Aleph and B by stating that claims were made for these codices by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort that have later been shown to be *“at best unbalanced.”*

Yet on the same page of his book, where he also declares Aleph and by association B as each *“a great treasure”* he insists in the same sentence that each is *“for all time a tremendously valuable asset to our knowledge of the New Testament.”*

White’s attempt at self-exoneration notwithstanding, his statement above appears *“at best unbalanced”* in the light of Burgon’s researches.

All the more so when the manuscript evidence reveals that the phrase that the *“learned critics,”* consisting of the notorious quintet<sup>62</sup> of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford, in addition to Westcott and Hort, deleted from Matthew 27:35 is actually a minority reading<sup>8 p 63, 9 p 74, 11 p 38</sup>. Nestle also deletes the phrase.

Why didn’t White trumpet the fact that the phrase *“that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots”* is not found in the ‘Majority’ Text? Why did he not advertise the fact that this particular phrase does not have the support of the extant copies of the Peshitta Syriac on this occasion and the extant copies of the Old Latin witnesses seem approximately equally divided?

Perhaps he did not want readers to examine his favourite sources too closely in the region of the ‘monstrosity’ – see Burgon above – in Matthew 27:49. The ‘collateral damage’ of so doing might have been prohibitively high. This is no doubt why Dr Ruckman has astutely highlighted the ‘monstrosity’ in his comments.

Moreover, White<sup>3 p 43</sup> has already discarded the Majority or Byzantine Text as *“conflated”* so he cannot use it in his favour now. See remarks in **Chapter 3.**

However, there is more.

Moorman – see above - indicates that up to 50 Greek manuscripts contain the phrase but these include the so-called Families 1 and 13, indicative of a 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century text<sup>9 p 27</sup> “*current in Caesarea.*” He also notes that Eusebius quotes the passage in 339 AD – Dr Hills<sup>8 p 63</sup> has an earlier date of 325 AD.

These citations are contemporaneous with White’s favoured sources *or even earlier.*

White clearly cannot reasonably account for a reading in Matthew 27:35 as having been ‘borrowed’ from another Gospel when it already existed in sources as old as his “*for all time...tremendously valuable asset(s) to our knowledge of the New Testament*” i.e. Aleph and B *or older* – including the favourable Old Latin witnesses.

Moorman also notes that the phrase is found in the God-honoured English Bibles predating the AV1611; Tyndale’s, Great, Geneva and Bishops’. So does Wycliffe’s New Testament of 1388<sup>46</sup>. The editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever likewise contain the phrase.

White is silent with respect to these facts as well.

With respect to his next target, Mark 6:11, White forgets that the disputed sentence, “***Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city***” does not match Matthew 10:15 from whence he says – again without proof - it came.

Matthew 10:15 reads, “***Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city.***”

If the sentence from Matthew 10:15 was copied into Mark 6:11, instead of the Lord’s statement quite reasonably being rendered independently (but slightly differently) each by Matthew and Mark, why are the underlined words missing from Mark’s account?

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 127ff</sup> alludes to the Greek wording of the two verses, his emphases.

“*Mark 6:11 comes from Matthew 10:15. Not if you can read first year Greek...The reading in Matthew 10:15 reads as follows:*

“(Uncial – ΓΗC OΔOMΩN KAI ΓOMOPPΩN)...

“*The reading in Mark 6:11 is written thusly: (Uncial - ECTAIC OΔOMOIC H ΓOMOPPOIC)...*

“***No copyist copied anything...[White] didn’t dare print EITHER Greek text because it would have proved that his borrowed hallucinations about “harmonization” were FALSE.***”

As indeed they are.

Again<sup>62</sup>, it is Griesbach, Lachmann – regarding the passage as doubtful, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford who remove the reading from Mark 6:11, preparing the way for Westcott and Hort and Nestle.

The reading as it stands in the AV1611 has overwhelming support<sup>8 p 64, 9 p 76</sup>, including the Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac, which pre-date Aleph and B, the main witnesses against it. Irenaeus cites the reading in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and it has support from the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible. See **Appendix, Table A16**. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits the reading but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>39 p 804</sup> all contain it.

Dean Burgon writes this<sup>13 p 409</sup> in his response to Bishop Ellicott, chairman of the RV Committee<sup>8 p 45</sup>, his emphases.

*“Were you not afraid, for instance, to leave out (from S. Mark vi. 11) those solemn words of our SAVIOUR - “Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gommorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city”? Surely you will not pretend to tell me that those fifteen precious words, witnessed to as they are by **all the known copies but nine**, - by the Old Latin, the Peschito and the Philoxenian Syriac, the Coptic, the Gothic, and the Ethiopic Versions, - besides Irenaeus and Victor of Antioch: - you will not venture to say (will you?) that words so attested are so evidently a “plain and clear error,” as not to deserve even a marginal note to attest to posterity ‘that such things were’! I say nothing of the witness of the Liturgical usage of the Eastern Church, - which appointed these verses to be read on S. Mark’s Day: nor of Theophylact, nor of Euthymius. I appeal to **the consentient testimony of Catholic antiquity**. Find me older witnesses, if you can, than the ‘Elders’ with whom Irenaeus held converse, - men who must have been contemporaries of S. John the Divine: or again, than the Old Latin, the Peschito, and the Coptic Versions. Then for the MSS., - Have you studied S. Mark’s Text to so little purpose as not to have discovered that the six uncials on which you rely [now numbering eight, headed up, as usual, by White’s “great treasures,” Ɀ, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ] on which you rely are the depositories of an abominably corrupt Recension of the second Gospel?”*

No reply from Bishop Ellicott was ever forthcoming. It is doubtful that White could have supplied one either. Burgon would most likely have described White’s book as “*abominably corrupt*” as well.

And the good Dean would have been right.

White uses Mark 10:21 to attack his preferred target yet again, Dr Mrs Riplinger.

*“Gail Riplinger alleges that while the KJV calls believers to “take up the cross,” the new versions “OMIT” this call. Though she does not give a specific citation to back up her claim, she is referring to Mark 10:21.”*

White is lying. He also lies<sup>3 p 189</sup> in his note, “*Riplinger has confirmed in her second book, Which Bible is God’s Word that I was correct in assuming she was referring to Mark 10:21.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 22, 158</sup> expands on her summary page with reference to the omission of “**take up the cross**” in Mark 10:21 by the modern versions.

*“The ‘New’ Christianity has put down their cross to follow Pied Piper preachers who present Christ carrying a credit card instead of a cross:... “Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits” Isaiah 30:10... Christians are rejecting the cross now, because they want the crown ‘now’ not ‘later’. They shop the bible for bargains and deals, dodging... 2 Timothy 2:12, “**If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us**”...”*

Confirmation of the reference was not delayed until the publication of Gail Riplinger’s second book<sup>96 p 37</sup>, in which she states, “*In Mark 10:21, the King James Version says, “take up the cross, and follow me”; the new versions just say, “come follow me.” We do not like to take up our cross daily. “My people” (not the heathen) love pied piper preachers who say, “Follow me, I won’t remind you of the cross.”*”

The reference was in *New Age Versions*. Dr Mrs Riplinger comments further on the reading in her response<sup>7 Part 1</sup> to White’s initial attack on *New Age Versions*, her emphases.

*“Page 158 of New Age Bible Versions pointed out the fact that the phrase “take up the cross” has been **completely** omitted in the NIV and NASB. Yet James White tries to put readers in doubt, as the whites of his eyes bulge out and he shouts,*



““Mrs. Riplinger **does** want people to think that this phrase is deleted from the Bible on the basis of Mark 10:21, and she **still** does not deal **honestly** with the presence of **the phrase** in three other places in the modern version.” [emphasis mine]

“There is a \$10,000 prize, if he can back up his lies. Readers of White won’t applaud...He has put his credibility in question by confusing his own inability to read, with the honesty of the author he reads. The three places to which he points are references to “**his** cross,” not “**the** cross” (Matt. 16:24, Luke 9:23, and Mark 8:34). These three parallel passages **do not** relate **at all** to those in Mark 10:21, Matt. 19:21, and Luke 18:22. The cross to which Jesus was referring in the former verses (“his cross”) is that **daily** crucifixion of the fleshly and self-serving desires of the Christian. The phrase immediately preceding it says, “let him deny **himself** (and take up his cross).” The word “**his**,” and its corresponding emphasis, also occurs in the verses which immediately follow it. Mark 15:21 was a foreshadowing of this daily crucifixion of the flesh as Simon was compelled to bear “**his** cross.” The following **other** verses expound this theme.

““I die daily” I Cor. 15:3

““[T]ake up **his** cross daily” Luke 9:23

““And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh...” Gal. 5:24

““I am crucified with Christ” Gal. 2:20

“On the other hand, “**the** cross,” omitted in new versions in Mark 10:21, refers to “**the** cross of Jesus” (John 19:25), “**the** cross of Christ” (I Cor. 1:17), and “**the** cross of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Gal. 6:14). “The preaching of **the** cross is the power of God unto salvation” (I Cor. 1:18). Taking up “**his** cross” daily will not **save** a person. “**The** cross of Christ” will. It is only **after** we have taken our sins to **the** cross, that our redeemer can help each of us bear **his** own cross.

“When someone like James White spends only a few **days** or even **months** writing a critique of a book which entailed six **years** of research, this reckless, broad brush approach results - painting its con artist into a corner...The vast majority of Greek MS **have** “take up the cross.” These include the uncials A (E) F (G) H, K, M, N, S, U, V, W, X, Y, Gamma, Pi, Sigma, Phi, Omega, fam 13 and the majority of all cursives. It is in the Old Latin: (a) q, Syr: (pesh) sim harc, Cop: (sa-mss) bo-mss, Goth (Arm) (Eth). It is also extant in 047, 05, 0211, 0257. The few corrupt manuscripts which omit it are Aleph, B, C, D, Theta, Psi, 0274, [almost no cursives], c, f, fz, g1 [of the Old Latin], and Vulg.

“**Every** word of God is important. The serpent added **ONE** word and changed the entire course of history. God said, thou “shalt surely die.” The serpent added **ONE** word and said, “Ye shall **NOT** surely die.” When Jesus **FIRST** met him in Luke 4:4, he brought this to his attention saying, “It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by **EVERY** word of God.” (New versions omit this last part.) Liberals have always said the Bible **CONTAINS** God’s **MESSAGE**. The Bible however says that it **is** the very **words** of God. New versions and their advocates, like White, **miss** the importance of **each** individual word. They are rapidly moving into the liberal camp where the serpent adds a word here and there, or like Eve, drops a word (“freely”). Paul preached a sermon on the importance of **one** letter(s) (Gal. 3:16). Those who are not concerned that there are 64,000 words missing in the NIV would invariably overlook the distinction between words like “**T-H-E**” and “**H-I-S**.” Since their NIV omits “but by **EVERY** word of God” (Luke 4:4), it’s no wonder. White is wrong. The new versions **do** omit “take up the cross”! Verses that say “his cross” are no substitute. His accusation that I am not “honestly” dealing with the topic is legally actionable.”

That is, White lied. But he continues.

*“The NIV and other modern translations do not include this phrase because the Greek texts they utilized in their work do not contain the words “take up the cross”...It is the judgement of the scholars who compiled [the Nestle-Aland] text that the phrase was not part of the original Gospel of Mark...”*

*“It is important that the phrase “take up the cross” appears four times in the King James Version of the Bible: Matthew 16:24; Luke 9:23; Mark 8:34; and the disputed passage at Mark 10:21....”*

In a lame effort to counter Dr Mrs Riplinger’s response, see above, White<sup>3 p 189</sup> takes refuge in ‘textual variants’ again, his emphases.

*“The other three passages have “take up **his** cross” rather than “take up **the** cross,” but even here the textual variant found at Mark 10:21 shows some manuscripts that have “take up **your** cross” as well.”*

Which manuscripts and how many, compared to the total that support the AV1611 reading? White studiously avoids these questions. He continues.

*“The first three all recount the same incident in the teaching ministry of the Lord Jesus. If there is indeed some “conspiracy” on the part of the modern translators to get rid of the call to take up the cross, surely they will delete this phrase in these passages as well...yet the modern translations have all three occurrences in their translations...”*

*“It is difficult to see how a charge of “conspiracy” can be made against the modern translations, unless one believes that theology is based on how often the Bible repeats a command. That is, if the Bible says “take up the cross” only three times, rather than four, this somehow makes the command less important...This kind of thinking is muddled. God’s truth is not decided by counting how many times He says the same thing. When God says, “Before me no god was formed, nor will there be one after me” (Isaiah 43:10, NIV), we do not ask that He repeat himself three or four more times before we will accept the great truth of monotheism...In the same way, Scripture records Jesus’ call to take up the cross in three places, and this is sufficient.”*

His self-centred arrogance aside about what “is sufficient” with respect to what God says – see remarks under **Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath** - White has lied three times in the above citation. The AV1611 has the expression “**take up the cross**” once, in Mark 10:21. The modern versions that White favours, NASV, NIV, do not contain the phrase at all. It is White’s thinking that is “muddled.” Moreover, he would have done better to have cited his favourite, the NASV, in Isaiah 43:10, because, even along with the NWT, it is in agreement with the AV1611, which has “**God**” in this verse, not “god,” which reading, as also found in the JB, *does* allow for polytheism.

White tries to justify the omission from manuscript evidence as follows<sup>3 p 161</sup>.

*“The oldest manuscripts of the New Testament [Aleph and B] do not contain the phrase.”*

He adds that “many others [and] entire translations in other languages lack the phrase” and further attempts to justify its omission by reference to the parallel passages, Matthew 19:21 and Luke 18:22, neither of which “records the phrase “take up the cross”.”

Thus White confidently concludes, his emphasis, that the omission of the phrase from “Matthew and Luke...in **all** manuscripts further verifies the propriety of not including it in Mark 10:21” and he further insists that bible believers “who would charge the modern texts with “heresy” for not including the later insertion at Mark 10:21 are hard pressed

*to explain why they do not make the same charge against both Matthew and Luke! Nearly all the charts produced by KJV Only advocates suffer from this same kind of double standard."*

Once again, it is White who is exercising a 'double standard.' He should question why the word "**daily**" was 'inserted' into Luke 9:23, when the parallel passages – as even White acknowledges them - Matthew 16:24, Mark 8:34 don't contain the word but Luke omits the Lord's rebuke to Peter, although it is found in Matthew 16:22, 23 and Mark 8:32, 33. White should really complain that the 'inconsistencies' between these three accounts demonstrate that somebody, somewhere has tampered with "*what was written by the original authors.*"

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 27, 80</sup> reveals that the 13+ manuscripts of Family 13, which has "*affinities with the Caesarean type of text...current in Caesarea in the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> centuries*" contain "**take up the cross**" in Mark 10:21. Although as Dr Mrs Riplinger indicates, the words are lacking from most of the Old Latin, 8 of the 10 extant copies, they are found with variation in the Peshitta Syriac. The question remains, therefore, how did the phrase "**take up the cross**" find its way into Mark 10:21 in a texts of approximately the same age as the manuscripts that White chooses to call, "*The oldest manuscripts of the New Testament [Aleph and B]*" or even earlier (the Peshitta)? White does not address this question.

But as Dr Moorman notes, "*There has always been an attempt to take the cross out of discipleship.*"

On this occasion, Tischendorf and Tregelles<sup>62</sup> influence Westcott and Hort and Nestle in removing the phrase, aided by Lachmann, who regards it as doubtful. Nevertheless, the reading, "**take up the cross**" in Mark 10:21 has support from the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits the words but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>39 p 812</sup> all have them with minor variation, in agreement with the AV1611.

Burgon states<sup>13 p 217, 510</sup>, his emphasis, and in part in his reply to Bishop Ellicott, "*What we complain of is that, misled by a depraved Text, our Revisers have often made nonsense of what before was perfectly clear: and have not only thrust many of our Lord's precious utterances out of sight, (e.g. Matt. xvii. 21: Mark x. 21 and xi. 26: Luke ix. 55, 56); but have attributed to Him absurd sayings which He certainly never uttered, (e.g. Matt. xix. 17) [i.e. the "stale crumb of Greek philosophy."* See Dr Hills's remarks<sup>65 p 143</sup> at the end of Chapter 6]...

*"We entirely miss many a solemn utterance of the SPIRIT, - as we are assured that verses 44 and 46 of S. Mark ix. are omitted by 'the best ancient authorities,' (whereas on the contrary, the MSS, referred to are **the worst**). Let the thing complained of be illustrated by a few actual examples. Only five shall be subjoined. The words in the first column represent what **you** are pleased to designate as among "the most certain conclusions of modern Textual Criticism" (p. 78), - but what **I** assert to be nothing else but mutilated exhibitions of the inspired Text. The second column contains the indubitable Truth of Scripture, - the words which have been read by our Fathers' Fathers for the last 500 years, and which we propose (GOD helping us,) to hand on unimpaired [not if James White has his way] to our Children, and to our Children's Children, for many a century to come:-*

*"REVISED (1881),*

*AUTHORIZED (1611),*

*"And come, follow me."*

*"And come, **take up the cross and** follow me."*

Burton's four other examples are Luke 9:54-56, 22:64, 23:38, 24:42, none of which White addresses in his book.

See additional comments above on Mark 9:44, 46, which White<sup>3 p 155</sup> excises from scripture as "not being part of what Mark originally wrote."

White<sup>3 p 160</sup> maintains that the phrase "**take up the cross**" in Mark 10:21 "was not a part of the original Gospel of Mark."

Burton states that the phrase is "the indubitable Truth of Scripture" and even White<sup>3 p 91</sup> acknowledges that Burton is a "true scholar of the first rank," so Burton must be right and White wrong.

Dr Ruckman<sup>3 p 104-6</sup> writes, his emphases, "The NIV and NASV get rid of the commandment to "**take up the cross**" and follow Christ, in Mark 10:21, by **pretending** that some scribe stole<sup>3 p 161-2</sup> it from Matthew 16:24 or Luke 9:23, but that time...the parallel account in Mark 10:21 was to be found in Matthew 19:21 and Luke 18:22, where the "harmonizer" could not go to "harmonize" a harmonica: although **that** is the place he would have had to go to add to Mark 10:21.

"**TAKE UP THE CROSS**" is not found in Luke or Matthew in the identical account of the rich young ruler. Somebody is lying again.

"Faced with clear, plain textual **dead ends** that no one could get out of, White...tries this route to get rid of the **King James** text. He says<sup>3 p 161-2</sup> that since "**take up the cross**" is not found in **two accounts**, it has **no business in a third account**: "Note that neither Matthew nor Luke records the phrase "take up the cross" in their Gospels at this point...the fact that the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke omit the phrase...further verifies the propriety of not including it in Mark 10:21." And then the dim-witted amateur accuses Bible believers of using a double standard for not accusing Matthew and Luke of "omissions." That is "ignorance aflame"...

"By [White's] standard..."

"1. The Ascension of Christ has no business in Luke 24:50-52, because it is **not** found in Matthew, Mark, or John in ANY Greek manuscript.

"2. The discourse on the True Vine (John 15) should be dropped immediately, along with the Lord's Prayer (John 17), for it is **not** to be found in Matthew, Mark, or Luke in ANY Greek manuscripts.

"3. If, when **two parallel passages** omit a phrase it is to be omitted in a third, then **all** of the following verses in Luke should be omitted: Luke 23:27-43, 48-49. **None of these** are found in the parallel accounts in Matthew, Mark, or John in ANY Greek text. While you're at it, delete John 19:8-12, 15, 25-27, 31-32, 34-36. Matthew, Mark, and Luke do not mention **any material** found in any of those verses, although they are **parallel accounts**.

"The answer to this is, "Oh, but we do have Greek manuscripts that contain those unique portions!" **Yes, and you have Greek manuscripts for a unique portion like Mark 10:21.** Now where are you? You are sitting right in Hort's lap parroting him like ventriloquist's dummy. How do you know **every manuscript** containing a "unique reading" that doesn't "match two other parallel accounts" wasn't **manufactured** out of thin air?"

White doesn't address this question. His naturalistic approach to the preservation of scripture prevents him from so doing. See discussion of White's "maximum uncertainty" in **Chapter 5**.

White<sup>3 p 163, 266</sup> seeks to justify the removal of **“through his blood”** from Colossians 1:14 as follows, his emphases.

*“It is natural to expect some “harmonization” of [Ephesians and Colossians] through normal scribal activity. This is why the NIV and others do not have the phrase “through his blood” at Colossians 1:14. It is missing not only in the dreaded “Alexandrian” manuscripts such as 8 and B, but from the majority of Greek manuscripts, including the majority of the Byzantine tradition!...the earliest Greek manuscript to contain it is from the ninth century, and the earliest Father to cite it in this way is from the late fourth century. In any case, even a brief examination of the situation, coupled with a minimal familiarity with the facts, demonstrates plainly that there is no “conspiracy” involved in the modern readings.”*

White is lying. Origen – or a “second century Jehudi” - was responsible for the omission of **“through his blood”** from Colossians 1:14<sup>8 p 84, 17, p 473-5</sup>. The phrase would therefore have to have existed in manuscript copies in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> removed the phrase from their editions and influenced Westcott, Hort and Nestle to do so.

White is wrong in stating that **“through his blood”** is missing from Colossians 1:14 in the majority of manuscripts. It is absent from the older, ‘alphabet’ uncial manuscripts but present in 5 of the ‘0’ uncials from the 9<sup>th</sup> (049, 0150, 0151) and 10<sup>th</sup> (056, 0142) centuries. The cursive manuscripts<sup>9 p 131, 55 p 219</sup> are about equally divided with respect to inclusion versus omission of the phrase. The Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac omit the phrase as does Wycliffe’s New Testament<sup>46</sup> but the bibles from Greek sources that precede the AV1611; Tyndale’s, Great, Geneva, Bishops’, all include the phrase<sup>134</sup>.

Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 23, 56</sup> notes that Athanasius (296-373 AD) omits **“through his blood”** in citing Colossians 1:14 and does not mention any other church father with respect to this verse but Kevin James<sup>76 p 225</sup> states that Irenaeus (130-202AD)<sup>130 p 28</sup> quotes **“through his blood”** in agreement with the AV1611 – and vindicating Dr Ruckman’s declaration<sup>17 p 474</sup> that **““through his blood” is the truth of God given by the Holy Ghost and preserved through nineteen centuries via the King James 1611 Authorized Version.”**

Kevin James indicates that Uncial 0142 omits the phrase, in conflict with Dr Moorman. See above. However, this discrepancy between sources does not materially disadvantage the balance of Greek manuscripts in favour of the phrase.

And Kevin James adds, effectively in direct refutation of White’s suppositions about ‘harmonization,’ *“Some manuscripts and the modern versions omit “through his blood.” This is a supposed addition to harmonize 1:14 with Ephesians 1:7 where the same words appear. Because there is no law that says Paul cannot repeat himself in a letter to a different destination, it could also be an erroneous omission.”*

It certainly could.

Overall, manuscript support for **“through his blood”** in Colossians 1:14 is much greater than White would have his readers believe and Kevin James is right to point out that the Apostle Paul was under no obligation not to repeat himself in writing to different churches.

Yet more support for **“through his blood”** in Colossians 1:14 arises from basic New Testament doctrine, with respect to redemption.

Dr Ruckman states<sup>17 p 473</sup>, his emphases, that *“no man in this age has “redemption” any other way than **“through his blood”** (see Rom. 3:25, Heb. 9:15). Furthermore, nobody*

was ever redeemed by the **forgiveness of sins** (Ex. 34:7). The reading, therefore, of every Bible on the market since Origen's Hexapla is a **Roman Catholic reading** misleading the sinner into thinking that "redemption" (Rom 3:25, Heb 9:35) is **synonymous** with "**forgiveness of sins**."

**"But it is not..."**

"*"Forgiveness of sins" is NOT "redemption."*

*"Israel was forgiven (Luke 23:34) but not redeemed (Acts 3:19). A man can be forgiven (Matt 18:32) and go to Hell. O.T. saints were forgiven (Ex 34:1-8), but none of them were redeemed at that time, or within 400 years of that time (Gal 4:5)."*

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 219</sup> writes.

*"We are told that we have redemption "through his blood" in Colossians 1:14. The Critical Text does not contain this phrase at this place, though it does appear in all texts in Ephesians 1:7. This raises two questions. First, why would the phrase be found in Paul's letter to the Ephesians and not in his letter to the Colossians? Second, how is it possible to have redemption without divine payment for that redemption? Clearly the phrase should remain in regard to this doctrine. The Greek manuscripts are evenly divided as to its inclusion or omission. This can be demonstrated with the two editions of the Majority Text. The internal evidence, based on Ephesians 1:7, would argue for its inclusion in that the phrase is used by Paul elsewhere and is consistent with what he would have written. Overall, when we consider other textual sources, the reading must remain because it is biblical and in character with Paul's other writings."*

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 131</sup> states, his underlinings, *"It can be argued that in each N.T. reference where redemption...is expounded, blood is always in the context – Rom. 3:24, 25; Eph. 1:7; Heb. 9:12-15; 1 Pet. 1:18; Rev. 5:9. There was no redemption until it was through his blood."*

This is a vital point that James White missed – along with the citation from Irenaeus, which pre-dates ⱼ and B by at least a century.

White<sup>3 p 163, 189</sup> now assures his readers that the NIV's use of "chosen" in Luke 9:35 is correct because *"the modern versions...follow the most ancient witnesses to the text,"* namely P45, P75, ⱼ, B, L Θ, X<sup>9 p 88-9</sup> and that **"beloved"** in Luke 9:35 in the AV1611 *"most probably comes from Mark 9:7."*

Clearly, the modern versions also follow some of the most *corrupted* witnesses to the text. See Pickering's evaluation above on the papyri and Burgon's evaluation of Codex L as a "vicious text" above and in **Chapter 3**, along with his evaluation of ⱼ and B.

White also contends that, *"some manuscripts have "beloved, in whom I am well pleased," drawing from yet another parallel source, Matthew 3:17 or 17:5. The two variant readings...show how pervasive this kind of harmonization of passages in the Gospels can be."*

He does not explain *which* manuscripts or how many have the additional clause. White's failure to provide the necessary clarification in this respect suggests that only a few manuscripts have the addition and the number does not significantly affect the overwhelming witness in favour of the AV1611's **"beloved"** in Luke 9:35.

Dr Moorman indicates that, in addition, to the majority of Greek manuscripts, the Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac support the AV1611 and their texts are contemporaneous with those of P45 and P75. He shows<sup>9 p 59</sup> that the third corrector of Codex C, Codices D, Ψ,

Old Latin d and an early copy of the Egyptian Bohairic Version support the AV1611 reading “*with some divergence.*” It may be that these few sources provided White with the opportunity to assert the supposed considerable ‘pervasiveness’ of “*harmonization of passages in the Gospels.*”

More seriously, White has overlooked Dr Jeffrey Young’s evaluation<sup>135</sup> of AV1611 versus NIV readings, with respect to the heresy of Adoptionism.

*“Adoptionism says that Jesus was an ordinary mere man before His baptism, and that He was possessed by the pure spirit Christ who descended on Him at His baptism. The adoptionist influence is revealed by denial of the virgin birth in Luke 2:33 where the KJV has “Joseph” but the NIV has “father” and in Luke 2:43 where the KJV has “Joseph and his mother” and the NIV has “parents”. In Luke 9:35 the KJV has God calling Jesus His “beloved Son” but the NIV has “Son, whom I have chosen”. The latter is consistent with Adoptionism, while the former is not.”*

The new versions are clearly teaching false doctrine in Luke 9:35, whereas the AV1611 is preserving correct doctrine.

As Dr Moorman rightly asks about the modern reading, “*Chosen from among whom?*”

Neither the modern version editors nor James White provide a satisfactory answer.

The Gothic pre-AD 350 and Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700 Bibles have “*beloved*” in Luke 9:35. See *Appendix, Table A16*. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops’<sup>39</sup> p 656 all have “*beloved*” in Luke 9:35.

White now attacks the reading “*draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and*” in Matthew 15:8 in the AV1611, insisting that “*the expansion of the quotation in the KJV is based upon the Greek Septuagint’s reading of Isaiah 29:13. In fact, it is a common trait of the Majority texts that Old Testament quotations will be harmonized to the form that is familiar to the scribe.*”

White provides no corroborative evidence of such “*a common trait.*” His statement is yet another of his bald unproven assertions but he continues.

*“The modern translations are obviously not attempting to “tamper” with anything, or “remove” anything...Many modern translations indicate citations of the Old Testament either by highlighting the text itself using italics or boldface, or indicate the source of the citation in a footnote. This would be a strange thing to do if there was some “conspiracy” afoot to “hide” some aspect of the text.”*

Contrary to White’s opinion, “*some aspect of the text*” has, in fact, been hidden. Kevin James<sup>76</sup> p 91 explains.

*“The Septuagint version does have “draweth nigh unto me,” but most Septuagint manuscripts omit “with their mouth and”...The parallel place at Mark 7:6 provides the solution for this “harmonization” problem. There, we find the wording: “This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.” This is an exact replica of the modern version rendering in Matthew 15:8. Instead of a King James harmonization to the Septuagint, this case is one of the clearest examples of Alexandrian family Gospel harmonization that can be asked for.”*

White cannot prove otherwise and he makes no reference to Mark 7:6.

In addition, it is therefore not surprising to find<sup>62</sup> that Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford omitted the reading “*draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and*”

from Matthew 15:8, again in turn influencing Westcott and Hort to delete it from the RV. Nestle likewise omits the phrase.

Dean Burgon<sup>131 p 137ff</sup> has a detailed explanation of why the phrase has disappeared from the modern renderings of Matthew 15:8, his emphases.

*“The place of Isaiah referred to, viz. ch. xxix. 13, reads as follows in the ordinary editions<sup>41</sup> of the LXX:— καὶ εἶπε Κύριος, ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί με [“And the Lord has said, This people draw nigh to me with their mouth, and they honour me with their lips”].*

*“Now, about the text of St. Mark in this place no question is raised. Neither is there any various reading worth speaking of in ninety-nine MSS. out of a hundred in respect of the text in St. Matthew. But when reference is made to the two oldest copies in existence, B and 8, we are presented with what, but for the parallel place in St. Mark, would have appeared to us a strangely abbreviated reading. Both MSS. conspire in exhibiting St. Matt. xv. 8, as follows:— ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ. So that six words (ἐγγίξει μοι [“draweth nigh unto me”] and τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν, καὶ [“with their mouth, and”]) are not recognized by them: in which peculiarity they are countenanced by DLT, two cursive copies, and the following versions:— Old Latin except f, Vulgate, Curetonian, Lewis, Peshitto, and Bohairic...To this evidence, Tischendorf adds a phalanx of Fathers:— ...Such a weight of evidence may not unreasonably inspire Dr. Tregelles [see above] with an exceeding amount of confidence. Accordingly he declares ‘that this one passage might be relied upon as an important proof that it is the few MSS. and not the many which accord with ancient testimony’...Dr. Tregelles insists ‘that on every true principle of textual criticism, the words must be regarded as an amplification borrowed from the Prophet. This naturally explains their introduction,’ (he adds); ‘and when once they had gained a footing in the text, it is certain that they would be multiplied by copyists, who almost always preferred to make passages as full and complete as possible’...*

*“The reader has now the hypothesis fully before him by which from the days of Griesbach it has been proposed to account for the discrepancy between ‘the few copies’ on the one hand, and the whole torrent of manuscript evidence on the other...*

*“We are invited then to believe [by James White in addition to Dr Tregelles], — for it is well to know at the outset exactly what is required of us, — that from the fifth century downwards **every extant copy of the Gospels except five** (DLT, 33, 124) exhibits a text arbitrarily interpolated in order to bring it into conformity with the Greek version of Isa. xxix. 13. On this wild hypothesis I have the following observations to make:—*

*“1. It is altogether unaccountable, if this be indeed a true account of the matter, how it has come to pass that in no single MS. in the world, so far as I am aware, has this conformity been successfully achieved: for whereas the Septuagintal reading is ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί με, — the Evangelical Text is observed to differ therefrom in no less than six particulars.*

*“2. Further, — If there really did exist this strange determination on the part of the ancients in general to assimilate the text of St. Matthew to the text of Isaiah, how does it happen that not one of them ever conceived the like design in respect of the parallel place in St. Mark?” An excellent question, which, as indicated, White fails to address. Burgon continues.*

*“3. It naturally follows to inquire, — Why are we to suspect the mass of MSS. of having experienced such wholesale depravation in respect of the text of St. Matthew in this*



place, while yet we recognize in them such a marked constancy to their own peculiar type; which however, as already explained, is **not** the text of Isaiah?

“4. Further, — I discover in this place a minute illustration of the general fidelity of the ancient copyists: for whereas in St. Matthew it is invariably ο λαός ουτος, I observe that in the copies of St. Mark, — except to be sure in (a) Codd. B and D, (b) copies of the Old Latin, (c) the Vulgate, and (d) the Peshitto (all of which are confessedly corrupt in this particular,) — it is invariably ουτος ο λαός. But now, — Is it reasonable that the very copies which have been in this way convicted of licentiousness in respect of St. Mark vii. 6 should be permitted to dictate to us against the great heap of copies in respect of their exhibition of St. Matt. xv. 8?

“And yet, if the discrepancy between Codd. B and κ and the great bulk of the copies in this place did not originate in the way insisted on by the critics, how is it to be accounted for? Now, on ordinary occasions, we do not feel ourselves called upon to institute any such inquiry, — as indeed very seldom would it be practicable to do. Unbounded licence of transcription, flagrant carelessness, arbitrary interpolations, omissions without number, disfigure those two ancient MSS. in every page [i.e. White’s “great codices”]. We seldom trouble ourselves to inquire into the history of their obliquities. But the case is of course materially changed when so many of the oldest of the Fathers and all the oldest Versions seem to be at one with Codexes B and κ. Let then the student favour me with his undivided attention for a few moments, and I will explain to him how the misapprehension of Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles and the rest, has arisen. About the MSS. and the Versions these critics are sufficiently accurate: but they have fatally misapprehended the import of the Patristic evidence; as I proceed to explain.

“The established Septuagintal rendering of Isa. xxix. 13 in the Apostolic age proves to have been this, — *Εγγίξει μοι ο λαός ουτος τοις χείλεσιν αυτων τιμωσι με* [“This people draw nigh to me, they honour me with their lips”]: the words *εν τω στοματι αυτων, και εν* [“with their mouth, and” as Kevin James indicates] being omitted. This is certain. Justin Martyr [100-165 AD]<sup>136</sup> and Cyril of Alexandria [d. 444 AD]<sup>136</sup> in two places so quote the passage. Procopius Gzaeus [475-538 AD]<sup>136</sup> in his Commentary on Origen’s Hexapla of Isaiah says expressly that the six words in question were introduced into the text of the Septuagint by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Accordingly they are often observed to be absent from MSS...”

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are the writers of the LXX versions in the third, fourth and sixth columns of Origen’s Hexapla respectively. Origen is the author of the fifth column version. Dr Ruckman<sup>137 p 61, 75ff</sup> shows that these writers compiled the LXX over the period AD 140-250. What Dean Burgon refers to as the Septuagint “in the Apostolic age” actually dates from the second century AD, i.e. after the New Testament books had been completed. Dean Burgon continues.

“[But] once the complementary words have been withdrawn, *εγγίξει μοι* [“draw nigh to me”] at the beginning of the sentence is worse than superfluous. It fatally encumbers the sense. To drop those two words, after the example of the parallel place in St. Mark’s Gospel, became thus an obvious proceeding...”

“Two facts have thus emerged, which entirely change the aspect of the problem: the first, (a) That the words *εν τω στοματι αυτων, και εν*, were anciently absent from the Septuagintal rendering of Isaiah xxix. 13: the second, (b) that the place of Isaiah was freely quoted by the ancients without the initial words *εγγίξει μοι*.

*“And after this discovery will any one be so perverse as to deny that on the contrary it must needs be Codexes B and 8, and not the great bulk of the MSS., which exhibit a text corrupted by the influence of the Septuagint rendering of Isaiah xxix. 13 [James White, possibly]?...*

*“The essential point is that the omission from St. Matthew xv. 8 of the words *τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν* is certainly due in the first instance to the ascertained Septuagint omission of those very words in Isaiah xxix. 13...*

*“The reader is now in a position to judge how much attention is due to Dr. Tregelles’ dictum ‘that this one passage may be relied upon’ in support of the peculiar views he advocates: as well as to his confident claim that the fuller text which is found in ninety-nine MSS. out of a hundred ‘must be regarded as an amplification borrowed from the prophet.’ It has been shewn in answer to the learned critic that in the ancient Greek text of the prophet the ‘amplification’ he speaks of did not exist: it was the abbreviated text which was found there. So that the very converse of the phenomenon he supposes has taken place. Freely accepting his hypothesis that we have here a process of assimilation, occasioned by the Septuagintal text of Isaiah, we differ from him only as to the direction in which that process has manifested itself.*

*“He assumes that the bulk of the MSS. have been conformed to the generally received reading of Isaiah xxix. 13. But it has been shewn that, on the contrary, it is the two oldest MSS. which have experienced assimilation. Their prototypes were depraved in this way at an exceedingly remote period.*

*“To state this matter somewhat differently. — In all the extant uncials but five, and in almost every known cursive copy of the Gospels, the words *τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν, καὶ* are found to belong to St. Matt. xv. 8. How is the presence of those words to be accounted for? The reply is obvious:— By the fact that they must have existed in the original autograph of the Evangelist. Such however is not the reply of Griesbach and his followers [including James White]. They insist that beyond all doubt those words must have been imported into the Gospel from Isaiah xxix. But I have shewn that this is impossible because, at the time spoken of, the words in question had no place in the Greek text of the prophet. And this discovery exactly reverses the problem, and brings out the directly opposite result. For now we discover that we have rather to inquire how is the absence of the words in question from those few MSS. out of the mass to be accounted for? The two oldest Codexes are convicted of exhibiting a text which has been corrupted by the influence of the oldest Septuagint reading of Isaiah xxix. 13.*

*“I freely admit that it is in a high degree remarkable that five ancient Versions, and all the following early writers, — Ptolemaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Didymus, Cyril [Observe how this evidence leads us to Alexandria (!)], Chrysostom and possibly three others of like antiquity, — should all quote St. Matthew in this place from a faulty text. But this does but prove at how extremely remote a period the corruption must have begun. It probably dates from the first century [or very early in the second – see Dr Ruckman’s comments above]. Especially does it seem to shew how distrustful we should be of our oldest authorities when, as here, they are plainly at variance with the whole torrent of manuscript authority. This is indeed no ordinary case. There are elements of distrust here, such as are not commonly encountered [i.e. apart from the faulty texts, and emphatically not in the transmission of the Traditional Text].”*

So much for White’s notion that *“The modern translations are obviously not attempting to “tamper” with anything, or “remove” anything.”*

The “*tampering*” was underway no later than the second century AD and, as Dr Wilkinson’s history shows – see **Introduction** – has been at work ever since, first in Alexandria, then in Caesarea and later in Rome under the papacy, then in all translation committees since and including that of Westcott and Hort in 1881.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits the phrase but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops’ Bible<sup>138</sup> all contain the words “*draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and*” with minor variation.

Next, White insists<sup>3 p 165</sup> that inclusion of the name “*Jesus*” in Matthew 16:20, omitted by the modern versions, is an “*expansion of piety*” because the phrase “*Jesus the Christ*” is “*unusual in the Gospels*” and “*makes little sense here*” because, supposedly, “*it is the Lord’s identity as the Messiah that is to be kept from the general public, not the name “Jesus”...nor the combination “Jesus the Christ.”*”

White indicates that<sup>3 p 189</sup> that “*the modern texts follow  $\aleph^*$  [original i.e. uncorrected text], B, L,  $\Theta$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $f^1$ ,  $f^{13}$ , [families 1, 13<sup>9, p 27-8</sup>] a number of miniscules, versions and Fathers.*”

Note first that Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit “*Jesus*” from their editions and in turn influence Westcott and Hort to delete the word from the RV. Nestle also omits “*Jesus*” from Matthew 16:20.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 67</sup> adds Codices X,  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Pi$ ,  $\Phi$  to the uncials that support the omission of “*Jesus,*” along with the Peshitta and 7 of the 14 extant Old Latin copies bearing witness to this verse. He shows that the second corrector of Codex  $\aleph$  plus up to 20 uncials, the majority of the cursives and the remaining 7 Old Latin copies – with some variation - support its inclusion.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> follows the modern versions in omitting “*Jesus*” but among the pre-AV1611 English bibles based on Greek sources, Tyndale<sup>47</sup> and the Geneva Bible<sup>49</sup> “*Jesus Christ*” and “*Jesus that Christ*” respectively and the Bishops’ Bible<sup>138</sup> has “*Jesus Christ.*” The AV1611 is therefore following in the tradition of the true Text of the Greek New Testament, as understood by these early English translators pre-dating the AV1611.

Again, therefore, the bulk of evidence favours the AV1611 reading and the half of the extant Old Latin witnesses that read “*Jesus,*” though not supported by the Peshitta, nevertheless confirm that the reading has ancient testimony, pre-dating the bible critics’ main sources, Aleph and B.

It is easy to dispose of White’s objection that the expression “*Jesus the Christ*” is “*unusual in the Gospels.*” The expression occurs only once in the New Testament, in Matthew 16:20 but each of the phrases “*the Lord’s Christ*” Luke 2:26 and “*the Christ of God*” Luke 9:20 also only occurs once in the New Testament. However, White does not describe them as being “*unusual*” because they are both found in the NASV, NIV. Neither does he complain about an apparent ‘expansion of piety’ in Matthew 16:16, with the scribe ‘embellishing’ Peter’s brief statement in Mark 8:29, “*thou art the Christ*” by ‘adding to the word of God’ with the phrase, “*the Son of the living God.*”

Of course, the NASV, NIV read with the AV1611 in these passages and that explains White’s silence.

But based on the ‘standard’ White applied to the AV1611 for Matthew 16:20, he is nevertheless being ‘inconsistent’ and manifesting ‘a double standard.’

He has also forgotten that, as Dr Ruckman warns<sup>123 p 38, 56</sup>, “*Satan is “anointed” as a “Christ,”*” Ezekiel 28:14 and therefore believers must distinguish between “*Jesus the*

**Christ**” Matthew 16:20 **“the Lord’s Christ**” Luke 2:26 and **“the Christ of God**” Luke 9:20 versus the **“false Christs**” of Matthew 24:24, Mark 13:22.

The Lord’s charge in Matthew 16:20 to His disciples is therefore intended to forestall any unwelcome attention<sup>121 p 305</sup> from Satanically-controlled authorities such as Judas and Theudas drew down upon themselves and were slain in the process, Acts 5:36, 37. The Lord had to survive in order to effect **“his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem**” Luke 9:31. The Enemy had already made more than one attempt on the Lord’s human life, e.g. Matthew 2:16-18, 4:6-7, 8:23-27 in order to eliminate his perceived rival for the principality of planet Earth, Luke 4:6, John 12:31, 14:30.

In sum, the AV1611 is correct, again. White and the modern versions are wrong, again.

White describes the AV1611’s use of **“unbelief”** in Matthew 17:20, versus the NIV’s **“little faith”** as possibly **“a simplified instance of scribal error... “Unbelief” is the more common term and had appeared just a few verses earlier (v. 17), therefore it is easy to understand how the switch could be made to it than the other way around [to “little faith”].”**

Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>62</sup> **“switch [to “little faith”]”** and thus the reading is found as such in the RV and Nestle and as **“littleness of your faith”** in the NASV. On this occasion, Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 67</sup> shows that both the majority of Greek witnesses, uncial and cursive, together with the majority of the Old Latin and the Peshitta support the AV1611 reading. Of the Greek uncials, only  $\aleph$ , B,  $\Theta$  support the modern alteration. Origen appears to have invented the modern reading, given that Tatian quotes the AV1611’s **“unbelief”** in his Diatessaron<sup>130 p 40</sup>. Compiled as early as 170 AD<sup>9 p 52</sup>, the Diatessaron predates Origen’s writings.

Dr Moorman observes that, **“the NIV reading is pointless.”** Indeed it is. What is the difference between **“little faith”** and **“faith as small as a mustard seed”**?

Burgon<sup>13 p 139-140</sup> affirms that the modern reading in Matthew 17:20 is among **“the alterations which have resulted from the adoption of a corrupt Text...every one of them being either a pitiful blunder or else a gross fabrication...The AV is better in every instance.”**

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> all have **“unbelief”** in Matthew 17:20.

White says of Matthew 21:12, which reads **“temple of God”** in the AV1611 versus **“temple”** in the modern versions such as the NASV, NIV that it **“illustrates how a textual variant can be utterly irrelevant to the meaning of the passage...what other temple could be referred to?”**

White<sup>3 p 189</sup> again attacks Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 259-260</sup>, who has included this verse in a table showing how new versions support New Age doctrine that God is just **“a God, one of many”** with the charge that **“seemingly that is Gail Riplinger’s thought when she cites this passage in her chart on page 260 of New Age Bible Versions.”**

Gail Riplinger’s thinking was sound, unlike James White’s. In the text of the chapter, he remarks that, **“someone may urge that this “change” is somehow meant to de-emphasize the role of God in the Bible.”** Dogmatically asserting that the verse under consideration **“is quite similar to Mark 10:21, and the insertion of “take up the cross,””** he confidently maintains that because **“[in] the parallel passages in Mark 11:15 and Luke 19:45, we have only “the temple”...the internal evidence (derived from the parallel passages) coincides with the external evidence (the earlier, non-Byzantine manuscripts).”**

Again, White is lying. He means *a small amount* of the external evidence and the *most corrupt* components of that evidence. See **Chapter 3** for detailed consideration of “*the earlier, non-Byzantine manuscripts.*”

If White’s “*internal evidence*” is reckoned as authentic, how does he explain the differences between Matthew 4:3-11 and the parallel passage in Luke 4:2-13? Naturally, White fails to address this question but it is central to his argument, if he is to be ‘consistent.’

Some further observations may be made about the available “*external evidence.*”

Lachmann and Tregelles omit “*of God*” from Matthew 21:12<sup>62</sup>. Their influence is sufficient for Nestle but not Westcott and Hort on this occasion, because the RV agrees with the AV1611 in this verse. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva Bible<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’ Bible<sup>138</sup> also have “*of God*” in Matthew 21:12, confirming that the AV1611 has preserved what bible believers understood to be the Traditional Text in Matthew 21:12 down through the centuries. Wycliffe’s agreement with the AV1611 indicates that the Old Latin Text, which he used<sup>39 p 788-9</sup> and which pre-dates X and B, was therefore faithful to the AV1611 in this verse.

The expression “*temple of God*” is found in Matthew 26:61 but not in the parallel or related passages, Mark 14:58, John 2:19. White might argue that the differences in the readings arise from the different words of false witnesses whose “*witness agreed not together*” Mark 14:56, 59. However, if White’s logic is followed, the reading in Matthew 26:61, like that of Matthew 21:12 also begs White’s question, “*what other temple could be referred to?*” White does not address this question, although he should, if he is to be ‘consistent.’

He also fails to explain why, if his logic is followed, the expression “*temple of God*” occurs in 2 Thessalonians 2:4, Revelation 11:1, 19, where surely in each of these verses, the emphasis on one temple is as strong as or even stronger than in Matthew 21:12, especially with respect to Revelation 11:19. These verses likewise beg White’s question, “*what other temple could be referred to?*” Again, no answer is forthcoming, indicating yet more ‘inconsistency’ on the part of James White.

Of course, the NASV, NIV read with the AV1611 in these passages - although the NIV has “*God’s temple*” in 2 Thessalonians 2:4, Revelation, 11:19 - so White would probably take refuge in the absence of “*textual variants*” but the main thrust of his objection to the AV1611’s reading in Matthew 21:12 is with respect to the words “*of God*” as being “*utterly irrelevant to the meaning of the passage.*” His objection is therefore unbalanced insofar as he fails to address the additional passages cited above where the words “*of God*” occur.

But inspection of the context of Matthew 21:12 shows further that White’s objection is also untrue.

Verse 13 makes reference to “*My house*” with the cross reference to Isaiah 56:7. So the words “*of God*” are not irrelevant to verse 12. They rightly emphasise Whose temple “*My house*” is and assure the Christian that, as “*the temple of God*” himself, *he* is now God’s house, bringing to pass what the Lord said in John 14:23. See underlining

***“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.”***

The emphasis is lost if “*of God*” is omitted from Matthew 21:12.

Focussing next on Mark 1:2, where the AV1611 has “*the prophets*” and the NIV, NASV have “*Isaiah the prophet*,” White<sup>3 p 166-8</sup> accuses bible believers of having “*the very same motives that...undoubtedly prompted the scribal alteration from “Isaiah the prophet” to “the prophets”.*” He quotes first from Dr Donald Waite<sup>23 p 146-7</sup>, Dr Waite’s emphases.

““*Instead of “IN THE PROPHETS,” the B/Aleph texts and the English versions have “IN THE PROPHET ISAIAH.” Though Mark 1:3 does refer to Isaiah 40:3, this verse 2 is found in Malachi 3:1 and NOT Isaiah! The way it stands in these false texts, it makes the Bible out as false and in error.*””

White then quotes from Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 116-7</sup>, his emphases.

““*Mark 1:2, 3. Using Origen’s corrupt “Septuagint,” Eusebius, Augustine, and Jerome conjectured that the quotation which followed was from Isaiah the prophet. Having made this conjecture without reading Malachi, all of them changed the verse from [“as it has been written in the prophets”] to [“as it has been written in Isaiah the prophet”]. The reader will find this Bible “boner” in the RV, ASV, RSV, Catholic Bible (any edition) and 95% of all the “new” Bibles...*

““*Which is correct?*

““*Well, if you are a conceited linguist who thinks he can sit in judgment on the Scripture, you will go to books written by Trench, Driver, Gesenius, Delitzsch, A. T. Robertson, Casper Gregory, Deissmann, Nestle, Westcott and Hort. If you are a Bible believing Christian, you will turn to the Book.*””

White now accuses Dr Ruckman of “circularity” because “*we are asking a question about a reading in the Bible [unspecified, as usual], whether it is “in Isaiah the prophet” or “in the prophets.” Ruckman says that if you are a Bible-believing Christian (which means, for him, if you believe only in the KJV) you will turn “to the Book,” i.e. to the KJV. So how does one know the KJV is right? Because the KJV says so, of course. Later in the same work he refers to this passage as a “famous scholarly ‘boo-boo,’” and says<sup>18 p 164</sup>, “Here the only Bibles that maintain the correct reading (which a 6<sup>th</sup>-grade pupil could understand!) are Tyndale, Young, the Geneva Bible, the Bishops’ Bible, and the A.V. 1611.”*”

Note again White’s “circularity.” How does he know that the AV1611 is ‘wrong’ in this verse? Because he can find some sources that disagree with it. How does he know these sources are correct? Because these sources disagree with the AV1611 of course!

To quote Spurgeon<sup>42</sup> again, “*Are these correctors of Scripture infallible? Is it certain that our Bibles are not right, but that the critics must be so? But where shall infallibility be found? The depth saith, ‘It is not in me’ yet those who have no depth at all would have us imagine that it is in them; or else by perpetual change they hope to hit upon it!*”

See **Chapter 3**.

It also seems to have escaped White’s notice that Dr Ruckman quite clearly believes not “*only in the KJV*” but also in faithful precursors to the AV1611, i.e. Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops’. As Dr Mrs Riplinger shows<sup>39</sup>, these earlier versions did not significantly vary from the AV1611 with respect to their texts. The King James translators were mainly engaged in a ‘polishing’ exercise.

White acknowledges that, “*part of the quotation given by Mark is from Malachi*” but insists that, his emphases, “*the reason why modern scholars are so confident that the proper reading is “in Isaiah the prophet” [is that] it is **much** easier to understand why a*

*scribe would try to...correct what seems to be an errant citation than to figure out why someone would change it to "Isaiah the prophet." But as in so many instances where a scribe thought he had encountered an error in the text, the error was, in fact, the scribe's, not the text's."*

The error is, in fact, James White's, as will be seen. He continues with what must be one of the flimsiest excuses for altering the scriptures that he has concocted yet.

In passing, he accuses Dr Ruckman<sup>3 p 189</sup> of devising an "*entertaining theory that men like Origen and Jerome didn't bother to read Malachi*" and insists that "*both men quoted widely from all of the Scriptures and could not in the least bit be accused of ignorance of the conflation of Malachi and Isaiah in Mark 1:2, 3.*"

So where is White's evidence of the necessary quotes from Origen and Jerome? Significantly, he fails to provide any. However, it turns out the White has misrepresented Dr Ruckman in this respect, as will be shown.

White next accuses bible believers of "*ignorance of the common forms of citation at the time of the writing of the New Testament.*" He then propounds his fatuous excuse for altering the scriptures as follows "*We have at least two instances...where a conflated citation of two different Old Testament prophets is placed under the name of the more important or major of the two prophets. One of these instances is found in Matthew 27:9, where Matthew attributes to Jeremiah a quotation that is primarily drawn from Zechariah.*"

He also alludes to "*the very same attempt on the part of some later scribes to change "Jeremiah" to "Zechariah" at Matthew 27:9, though in this case their attempts did not become the majority reading of the manuscripts.*"

It does not occur to White to ask *why* these attempts failed. Perhaps the providential preservation of the scriptures provides the answer. See **Chapter 3** for Pickering's analogy of the sewer pipe discharging into the pure stream.

White's "*other instance*" is "*Mark 1:2-3, where a conflated reading combining Malachi 3:1 with Isaiah 40:3, is cited under the single name of the more major of the two prophets, Isaiah. This was, as we have said, common practice in that day.*"

A mere two examples, both of which are spurious as will be seen, hardly demonstrate "*common practice,*" especially when one of those examples is the very passage for which the so-called "*common practice*" is to be established. Pickering's conclusion with respect to Kenyon's attempts to show that the 'Byzantine' Text is 'late,' as outlined in **Chapter 3**, applies equally here.

White insists on "*a conflated reading [in Mark 1:2-3]...under the single name of the more major of the two prophets*" but that so-called method of citation "*is the very point to be proved and may not be assumed.*"

It is clear from the above that White is in fact engaging in yet more 'circularity.'

Yet again, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> are responsible for the modern departure from the AV1611, which is found in Nestle and the RV.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 75</sup> confirms that the majority of Greek witnesses, both uncial and cursive, have the AV1611 reading "***the prophets***" and that ⱼ, B, D, L, Δ, Θ are the main witnesses amongst the few Greek sources that read "*Isaiah the prophet.*" Family 1<sup>9 p 27</sup> of "*the type of text current in Caesarea in the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> centuries*" also has this reading and so does

the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac. Family 1 consists of approximately 6 (5+) manuscripts.

However, Family 13, representing the same type of text and vintage as Family 1, agrees with the AV1611 and therefore shows that the reading “**the prophets**” certainly existed at the time of the compilation of the old uncials. Irenaeus (130-202 AD) and Tertullian (160-220 AD) also quote “**the prophets**” in Mark 1:2<sup>130 p 42</sup> and their combined testimony clearly predates the old uncial sources that White explicitly cites, i.e. the reading “**the prophets**” could not be a later alteration. Family 13 consists of 13+ manuscripts.

Dr Moorman observes reasonably that, “*The next verse quotes Isaiah 40:3, but verse 2 is from Malachi 3:1; thus it can only be “in the prophets.”*”

Using the textual apparatus of the United Bible Societies 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Greek New Testament, White<sup>3 p 254-5</sup> lists in addition to the 6 uncials above and Family 1, 9 cursive manuscripts and one lectionary or responsive reading<sup>8 p 5</sup> manuscript as having the reading “*Isaiah the prophet.*” He gives the Armenian Version, of the 5<sup>th</sup> century<sup>13 p 9</sup> and the Georgian Version, of the 6<sup>th</sup> century<sup>13 p 454</sup>, as having this reading but Dr Moorman gives the Armenian Version as agreeing with the AV1611 reading, “**the prophets.**”

White states further that “*Irenaeus, Origen, Serapion, Epiphanius, Severian, Hesychius and numerous Latin manuscripts*” have “*Isaiah the prophet*” and considers that the above external evidence “*alone would be sufficient*” to reject the reading of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible. However, he adds that, “*the internal considerations are even stronger.*” These “*internal considerations*” consist of his pretentious explanation of how “*a conflated citation of two different Old Testament prophets is placed under the name of the more important or major of the two prophets*” – see above – and this explanation will be shown to be false. (In passing, it could be asserted that “*internal considerations*” surely support the AV1611 reading – see Dr Moorman’s observation above.)

White then gives a list of 5 mixed sources, including a lectionary manuscript, a Syriac Version and Origen, Jerome and Augustine which change “*Jeremiah*” to “*Zechariah*” in Matthew 27:9 – see above – and lists 3 Greek manuscripts; Φ, 33, 157, which, along with “*others*” have no name in the verse. White then insists that, “*If KJV Only advocates were consistent, they would need to adopt this reading as well!*”

Not if, as is the case, it is contradicted by greater evidence in favour of the Traditional reading, i.e. “**Jeremy the prophet.**” Dean Burgon has a searching analysis of the external evidence that White puts forward and Burgon shows that the evidence of the church fathers is not as White and the UBS suppose. See below and note from Dr Moorman’s evidence above that Irenaeus does *not* support the reading “*Isaiah the prophet*” in Mark 1:2.

When White levelled the criticism of ‘circularity’ at Dr Ruckman, he quite deceitfully forbore to expand on the citation from Dr Ruckman’s book, no doubt because if he had done so his accusation would have disintegrated.

Dr Ruckman is simply applying the principle of “**comparing spiritual things with spiritual**” 1 Corinthians 2:13, which as has been stated already is not ‘circular’ reasoning but *scriptural* reasoning. See **Introduction**. Dr Ruckman writes, his emphases.

“*Whom is Mark quoting in Mark 1:2, 3?*”

“*It is perfectly apparent that verse 3 is a quotation from Isaiah 40, but what is verse 2? Verse 2, by any man’s standards (who isn’t half out of his mind), is a quotation from Malachi 3:1. The verses, then, are citations from Malachi and Isaiah – “prophets.” Not “Isaiah the prophet”...How is it that the greatest and most brilliant linguists of 16 centu-*



ries – Origen to Hort - cannot even **read** the Bible? Couldn't any man have found Malachi 3:1 (even if he was "neutral")?..."

Dr Ruckman is not putting forward an "entertaining theory" here. He is simply asking a question, a fact that White has overlooked, probably because his reading of Dr Ruckman's work was itself superficial.

And he has failed to notice that Dr Ruckman has a more searching analysis.

*"The problem lies much deeper. The first neutral critic (Origen) who approached Mark 1:2, 3 saw immediately what he was getting into, for the cross-reference, in Malachi, was to the Lord God Jehovah of the Old Testament, saying "My messenger...before ME!" If this was the right reference, then Jesus Christ was Jehovah God, manifested in the flesh! So the "neutral" critic took the "doctrinally suspect" passage and altered it! He made it refer to Isaiah only, instead of "the prophets." The "majority of scholars" for the next 13 centuries accepted this perversion of the truth as a "neutral" text!"*

See also comments in **Chapter 5**.

So contrary to White's assumption of Dr Ruckman's "entertaining theory" – see above – it is clear from Dr Ruckman's analysis that Origen was aware of Malachi and chose to alter the scriptures instead of believing them, furnishing clear proof that he was a bible corrupter and in turn yet more unequivocal refutation of White's first, second and third postulates. See **Summary** and **Introduction**.

Dean Burgon's<sup>131 p 100, 112ff</sup> analysis of Mark 1:2 is particularly instructive when contrasted with White's pretence<sup>3 p 154-164</sup> that scribes for the manuscripts underlying the AV1611 repeatedly 'borrowed' readings from one Gospel and transferred them to another. White terms this procedure, which he fails to substantiate, "harmonization" or "parallel influence."

Dean Burgon shows that this procedure did occur but is largely associated with the corrupt manuscripts underlying the modern versions, although these corruptions occasionally influenced those sources that usually support the Traditional Text, such as the Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac. Dean Burgon refers to this procedure as "Assimilation."

*"Sometimes the expressions of one Evangelist get improperly transferred to another. This is a large and important subject which calls for great attention, and requires to be separately handled. The phenomena alluded to...may be comprised under the special head of Assimilation..."*

*"The first two verses of St. Mark's Gospel have fared badly. Easy of transcription and presenting no special difficulty, they ought to have come down to us undisfigured by any serious variety of reading. On the contrary. Owing to entirely different causes, either verse has experienced calamitous treatment...Origen is responsible to some extent...for the frequent introduction of 'Isaiah's' name into verse 2 - whereas 'in the prophets' is what St. Mark certainly wrote; but the appearance of 'Isaiah' there in the first instance was due to quite a different cause.*

*"In the meantime, it is witnessed to by the Latin, Syriac, Gothic, and Egyptian versions, as well as by  $\kappa$ B $\Delta$ L $\Lambda$ , and (according to Tischendorf) by nearly twenty-five cursives; besides the following ancient writers: Irenaeus, Origen, Porphyry, Titus, Basil, Serapion, Epiphanius, Severianus, Victor, Eusebius, Victorinus, Jerome, Augustine. I proceed to shew that this imposing array of authorities for reading ["in Isaiah the prophet"] instead of ["in the prophets"] in St. Mark i. 2, which has certainly imposed upon every recent editor and critic [Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Words-*

worth, Green, Scrivener, McClellan, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers] — has been either overestimated or else misunderstood.

“1. The testimony of the oldest versions, when attention is paid to their contents, is discovered to be of inferior moment in minuter matters of this nature. Thus, copies of the Old Latin version thrust Isaiah’s name into St. Matt. i. 22 and Zechariah’s name into xxi. 4: as well as thrust out Jeremiah’s name from xxvii. 9:- the first, with Curetonian, Lewis, Harkleian, Palestinian, and D, — the second, with Chrysostom and Hilary, — the third, with the Peshitto... What is to be thought of Cod.  $\kappa$  for introducing the name of ‘Isaiah’ into St. Matt. xiii. 35, — where it clearly cannot stand, the quotation being confessedly from Ps. lxxviii. 2; but where nevertheless Porphyry, Eusebius and pseudo-Jerome certainly found it in many ancient copies?”

The deliberate alteration of Matthew 27:9 shows that, regrettably, even the normally sound Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac were not invulnerable to wilful corruption and also explains why Wycliffe’s New Testament<sup>46</sup> has the incorrect reading “*Isaiah the prophet*” in Mark 1:2. As Dr Ruckman has noted, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all have the correct reading “*the prophets*.”

Burgon’s evidence, moreover, casts yet more doubt on the veracity of White’s “*great codex*,” Aleph. Burgin continues.

“2. Next, for the testimony of the Uncial Codexes  $\kappa$ B $\Delta$ L $\Delta$ :— If any one will be at the pains to tabulate the 900 new ‘readings’ adopted by Tischendorf in editing *St. Mark’s Gospel*, he will discover that for 450, or just half of them, — all the 450, as I believe, being corruptions of the text, —  $\kappa$ BL are responsible: and further, that their responsibility is shared on about 200 occasions by D: on about 265 by C: on about 350 by  $\Delta$ . [At] some very remote period therefore there must have grown up a vicious general reading of this Gospel which remains in the few bad copies: but of which the largest traces (and very discreditable traces they are) at present survive in  $\kappa$ BCDLA. After this discovery the avowal will not be thought extraordinary that I regard with unmingled suspicion readings which are exclusively vouched for by five of the same Codexes: e. g. by  $\kappa$ B $\Delta$ L $\Delta$ .

Codex  $\Theta$  was evidently not discovered until after Burgon published his research. Its addition to “*the few bad copies*” does not materially affect his conclusions. Burgon continues, his emphasis.

“3. The cursive copies which exhibit ‘Isaiah’ in place of ‘the prophets,’ reckoned by Tischendorf at ‘nearly twenty-five,’ are probably less than fifteen and those, almost all of suspicious character. In the text of *Evan. 72* the reading in dispute is **not** found: 205, 206 are duplicates of 209: and 222, 255 are only fragments. There remain 1, 22, 33, 62, 63, 115, 131, 151, 152, 161, 184, 209, 253, 372, 391:— of which the six at Rome require to be re-examined. High time it is that the inevitable consequence of an appeal to such evidence were better understood.”

White’s cursives are numbered 33, 205, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1243, 2427 l (lectionary) 253. Burgon clearly knew of 33, 205. The remaining 8 are probably later discoveries but still too few in number to affect Burgon’s analysis. He continues.

“4. From Tischendorf’s list of thirteen Fathers, serious deductions have to be made. Irenaeus [as Dr Moorman shows – see above] and Victor of Antioch are clearly with the *Textus Receptus*. Serapion, Titus, Basil do but borrow from Origen; and, with his argument, reproduce his corrupt text of *St. Mark i. 2*. The last-named Father however saves his reputation by leaving out the quotation from Malachi; so, passing directly from the mention of Isaiah to the actual words of that prophet. Epiphanius (and Jerome too on

one occasion) does the same thing. Victorinus and Augustine, being Latin writers, merely quote the Latin version (*'sicut scriptum est in Isaiâ propheta'*), which is without variety of reading. There remain Origen (the faulty character of whose Codexes has been remarked upon already), Porphyry the heretic (who wrote a book to convict the Evangelists of mis-statements, and who is therefore scarcely a trustworthy witness), Eusebius, Jerome and Severianus. Of these, Eusebius and Jerome deliver it as their opinion that the name of 'Isaiah' had obtained admission into the text through the inadvertency of copyists. Is it reasonable, on the slender residuum of evidence, to insist that St. Mark has ascribed to Isaiah words confessedly written by Malachi?"

Yes, according to James White. Note, however, that Burgon has accounted for 5 of the 6 Fathers than White lists, the exception being Hesychius. But this sole additional source cannot reasonably affect Burgon's analysis. He continues.

"*'The fact,'* writes a recent editor in the true spirit of modern criticism, 'will not fail to be observed by the careful and honest student of the Gospels' [or in the words of James White<sup>3 p 13</sup>, one of "truth and honesty"]. But what if 'the fact' should prove to be 'a fiction' only? And (I venture to ask) would not 'carefulness' be better employed in scrutinizing the adverse testimony? 'honesty' in admitting that on grounds precarious as the present no indictment against an Evangelist can be seriously maintained? This proposal to revive a blunder which the Church in her corporate capacity has from the first refused to sanction (for the Evangelistaria know nothing of it) carries in fact on its front its own sufficient condemnation. Why, in the face of all the copies in the world (except a little handful of suspicious character), will men insist on imputing to an inspired writer a foolish mis-statement, instead of frankly admitting that the text must needs have been corrupted in that little handful of copies through the officiousness of incompetent criticism?"

What James White describes as "*the reason why modern scholars are so confident that the proper reading is "in Isaiah the prophet"*" is thus shown by Burgon to be "*a foolish mis-statement,*" demonstrating "*that the text must needs have been corrupted in that little handful of copies through the officiousness of incompetent criticism.*"

Such as James White's. Burgon then explains how the reading "*Isaiah the prophet*" came to be inserted in Mark 1:2.

"*And do any inquire, — How then did this perversion of the truth arise? In the easiest way possible, I answer. Refer to the Eusebian tables [parallel Gospels], and note that the foremost of his sectional parallels is as follows: —*

*"Matthew iii. 3                      Mark i. 3                      Luke iii. 3-6                      John i. 23"*

Each of the above passages contains the quotation from Isaiah 40:3, "***The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight***" or as in John, "***the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord.***"

Those from Matthew, Luke and John each refer to "***the prophet Esaias***" or "***Esaias the prophet.***" (It is interesting that White does not try to pretend that various scribes transferred the quotation from Isaiah from one Gospel to another, probably because the NASV, NIV read as the AV1611 does in these passages. But how can he disprove, according to his naturalistic approach to preservation of the scriptures that some scribes *did* do this and left no extant textual variants? See **Chapter 5**, for Dr Hills's warnings about "*maximum uncertainty,*" to which White is a party.)

Burgon therefore concludes, his emphases, "*Now, since the name of Isaiah occurs in the first, the third and the fourth of these places in connexion with the quotation from Is. xl. 3,*

*what more obvious than that some critic with harmonistic proclivities should have insisted on supplying **the second also**, i. e. the parallel place in St. Mark's Gospel, with the name of the evangelical prophet, elsewhere so familiarly connected with the passage quoted? This is nothing else in short but an ordinary instance of Assimilation, so unskillfully effected however as to betray itself. It might have been passed by with fewer words, for the fraud is indeed transparent, but that it has so largely imposed upon learned men, and established itself so firmly in books. Let me hope that we shall not hear it advocated any more."*

The good Dean's hopes were not realised sadly, as White's unskillful dissertation on Mark 1:2 starkly reveals.

However, Dean Burgon's analysis, together with Dr Ruckman's explanation, confirm that "**the prophets**" is the correct reading in Mark 1:2 and provide the means, in the words of James White, "to figure out why someone would change it to *"Isaiah the prophet."*

White's only other example of a supposedly "conflated citation" is Matthew 27:9, which states, together with verse 10, "**Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; And gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me."**

The cross reference is to Zechariah 11:13, which states, "**And the LORD said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the LORD."**

The citation is not a conflation. Jeremiah spoke the words. Zechariah recorded them in scripture and so did Matthew.

Dr Ruckman<sup>121 p 639</sup> has this comment, his emphases. It would have benefited White if he had read it.

*"The words are not **written in Jeremiah**, but are written in Zechariah 11. However, Zechariah 7:7 is a plain warning to remember not only what Jeremiah **wrote**, but what he **said**...The citation is quoted from an **oral speech**, **not a written one**."*

*"Should ye not hear the words which the **LORD hath cried by the former prophets, when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity, and the cities thereof round about her, when men inhabited the south and the plain?"** Zechariah 7:7.*

Note that the words of the Old Testament prophets are "**spoken of the Lord by the prophet**" Matthew 2:15 and therefore Lord may choose who records the words, either the prophet himself, Hosea 11:1, Isaiah 40:3, Matthew 3:3, Isaiah 9:1, 2, Matthew 4:14-16, Isaiah 53:4, Matthew 8:17, Isaiah 42:1-3, Matthew 12:17-21, Zechariah 9:9, Matthew 21:4, 5, Psalm 22:18, Matthew 27:35 or another prophet, as in Zechariah 11:13, Matthew 27:9.

Finally, White's notion that "a conflated reading combining Malachi 3:1 with Isaiah 40:3, is cited under the single name of the more major of the two prophets, Isaiah...[as] common practice in that day" is patently false.

**"And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene"** Matthew 2:23.

Halley<sup>116 p 420</sup> states "The prophecy here that Matthew refers to is thought to be Isaiah 11:1; Jeremiah 23:5; Zechariah 3:8, where the Messiah is spoken of as the "Branch."

*The Hebrew form of the word Nazareth means “Branch.” So Jesus was a Nazarene in a double sense. He lived at Nazareth, and He was the Branch foretold in Prophecy.”*

***“It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me”*** John 6:45.

The prophecy here is Isaiah 54:13 with a cross-reference to Jeremiah 31:34.

***“And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things”*** Acts 15:15-17.

The prophecy referred to is that of Amos 9:11, 12 but elements of it may be found in Isaiah 58:12 and Jeremiah 30:18.

White does not comment on these verses because the NASV, NIV read as the AV1611 and White would insist there are no “*textual variants*” but “*Common practice in that day*” was clearly not as White pretends. It was as set forth in Mark 1:2, i.e. “*the prophets,*” without singling out any particular individual as “*major.*” Note how Peter exhorts the elders as “*also an elder*” 1 Peter 5:1, John writes as “*your brother*” Revelation 1:9, James addresses “*My brethren*” James 1:2 and so does Paul, Philippians 3:1, 4:1. That is, none of the apostles perceived themselves as “*major.*”

As the Lord Jesus Christ said, “*but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant*” Matthew 20:26, 27:

They were “*ensamples to the flock*” 1 Peter 5:3 and shunned “*being lords over God’s heritage.*”

Unlike James White and his fellow travellers.

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 55, 146-8</sup> has these comments on Mark 1:2, his emphases, which impinge directly on White’s allusion to Matthew 27:9.

*“In Mark 1:2...the Traditional Text and the Cappadocian Fathers render the passage as “prophets”...*

*“The reading of the Traditional Text...is found in many of the Greek uncials, (A, K, P, W, Π), the majority of Greek miniscules (28, 1009, 1010, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1242, 1252, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148) and the majority of Greek lectionaries...*

*“It has been noted that Isaiah was the major prophet and therefore he takes pre-eminence over Malachi. To illustrate this point, scholars often refer to Matthew 27:9. They claim this passage is not really a citation of Jeremiah but instead a quotation of Zechariah 11:12. Jeremiah receives pre-eminence as the major prophet.*

*“However, this point can be argued. The text in Matthew does not say it was **written** as the passage in Mark does. Instead the text in Matthew states, “Then was fulfilled that which was **spoken** by Jeremy.” God, the Author of Scripture, is aware of who writes what and who speaks what. Simply because Zechariah writes the passage does not mean Jeremiah did not speak it. Also, Zechariah warned Israel to pay attention to what the former prophets had spoken (Zechariah 7:7)...*

*“The position presented by many [including James White] that some copyists made the change from “Isaiah the Prophet” to “the prophets” in Mark 1:2 in order to correct what*

*was perceived as a possible error is conjecture. One can just as easily speculate that an Egyptian copyist not overly familiar with Jewish Old Testament prophets recognised the Isaiah quote and made the change for what he considered to be better clarity. The point still remains that both sides have textual support for their respective positions. It is also understood, as Dr George Kilpatrick has noted, that most of these types of textual variants were introduced into the manuscripts by the second century. Therefore, one reading is as likely (textually speaking) as the other. The difference is contextually. It is more truthful to say “the prophets” when citing two prophets. Accordingly, the reading in the Traditional Text is both textually substantial and contextually correct.”*

If two authorities conflict, it will usually require a third and ‘final’ authority to resolve them. The AV1611 will always fulfil this responsibility more reliably than either James White or any of his cronies. It will also be able to do so long after they and their adherents are literally **“but dust and ashes”** Genesis 18:27, humanly speaking, if the Lord delays His return long enough (It is to be hoped that he does not.).

White<sup>3 p 168-9</sup> thinks that **“for them who trust in riches”** should be excised from Mark 10:24, because “*Ⲙ and B do not contain the reading...these two manuscripts carry a great deal of weight*” and “*if [the reading] is contained in the text, its absence in Ⲙ and B should be noted...the reader should be given all the information available*” because, according to White<sup>3 p 189</sup>, “*One might note that this fact [the omission of “for them who trust in riches” from Mark 10:24 in Ⲙ and B] favours the textual veracity of Ⲙ and B, given the early rise of ascetic piety in Egypt.*”

Resulting in what kind of outcomes? White provides no information, so there cannot have been any of significance.

As the Lord Jesus Christ said, **“Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them”** Matthew 7:20.

It should also be remembered that<sup>8 p 10</sup>, White’s opinion notwithstanding,

1. God called His Son out of Egypt, Matthew 2.
2. God called Jacob out of Egypt, Genesis 49.
3. God called Israel out of Egypt, Exodus 15.
4. God called Joseph’s bones out of Egypt, Exodus 13.
5. God never wanted His people to return to Egypt, Deuteronomy 17:16.

And Dean Burgon’s remarks, his emphases, should be remembered<sup>13 p 16, 315-316</sup> if “*the reader should be given all the information available.*” Unlike White, Dean Burgon subjected Codices Ⲙ and B to close scrutiny. See **Chapter 3**.

*“We venture to assure [the reader], without a particle of hesitation, that Aleph B D are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant: - exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with...the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of the Truth, - which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God.*

*“The impurity of the Texts exhibited by Codices B and Aleph is not a matter of opinion but a matter of fact. These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence. So far from allowing Dr. Hort’s position that ‘A Text formed by taking Codex B as the sole authority would be incomparably nearer the truth than a Text similarly taken from any other Greek or single document’ we venture to assert that it would be on the contrary, **by***

*far the foulest Text that had ever seen the light: worse, that is to say, even than the Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort. And that is saying a great deal.*”

But White advances more reasons for the omission, his emphases.

*“The appearance of the “rich man” in verse 25 called for a smoother transition into this topic than provided by verse 24 in the form found in  $\aleph$  and B. What is more, the words in verse 24, without the added limitation, seemed too harsh to many readers. Again we see that it is easier to understand how the phrase could be **added** than to understand why it would have been **deleted**.”*

No, it isn't and White himself seems unconvinced on this occasion by his unsubstantiated conjectures because even he allows that *“simple scribal error...is, of course, a possibility.”*

Such an error is actually a certainty. Of the modern editors<sup>62</sup> before Westcott and Hort, only Tischendorf was bold enough to remove the phrase from Mark 10:24 and even Westcott and Hort retained it in the RV, although Nestle removes it, along with the NIV and NASV.

This modern omission, going beyond even the RV, illustrates once again the steady advance of textual corruption away from the Text of the AV1611. See remarks under *The Jesuits – ‘Engineer Corps of Hell.’*

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 80-1, 130 p 43</sup> reveals that the Old Latin, 8 of the 11 extant copies, 2 with variation and the Peshitta Syriac each have the AV1611 reading *“for them that trust in riches”* and Tatian has the reading in his Diatessaron in 170 AD. It bears repeating that the texts embodied by these witnesses predate the uncials that White uses to justify the omission by over 100 years. The pre-350 AD Gothic, as Moorman confirms and pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bibles contain *“for them that trust in riches”* in Mark 10:24. See *Appendix, Table A16*. Uncials A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Y,  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Theta$ ,  $\Pi$ ,  $\Sigma$ ,  $\Phi$ ,  $\Omega$ , 047, 055, 0257 and possibly 0133, 0211, i.e. 24-26 uncial witnesses and the majority of cursives contain the phrase. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> all contain the phrase.

Dr Moorman indicates that  $\aleph$ , B,  $\Delta$ ,  $\Psi$  are almost the only witnesses in favour of the omission and shrewdly observes that, *“Christendom places great trust in its amassed wealth and properties. See 2 Peter 2:3.”*

It should also be remembered in all these comparisons that although the majority of manuscripts that usually support the AV1611 Text are themselves late i.e. from the 9<sup>th</sup> century onwards<sup>8 p 5</sup> until the invention of printing, they embody a text that is older than the 4<sup>th</sup> century uncials such as  $\aleph$ , B that White so highly – and erroneously – esteems. These old uncials are but aberrations of the true or Traditional Text that faithful bible believers have preserved since apostolic times unto its perfect and finally authoritative refinement as the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible in biblical English.

See Dr Hills's remarks<sup>8 p 134-5</sup>, citing Burgon, in *Chapter 3*.

*“Burgon regarded the good state of preservation of B and Aleph in spite of their exceptional age as a proof not of their goodness but of their badness. If they had been good manuscripts, they would have been read to pieces long ago. “We suspect that these two manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, SOLELY TO THEIR ASCERTAINED EVIL CHARACTER; which has occasioned that the one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in A.D. 1844)*

got deposited in the wastepaper basket of the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai. Had B and Aleph been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight.”

““Thus the fact that B and Aleph are so old is a point against them, not something in their favour. It shows that the Church rejected them and did not read them. Otherwise they would have worn out and disappeared through much reading. Burgon has been accused of sophistry in arguing this way, but certainly his suggestion cannot be rejected by naturalistic critics as impossible. For one of their “own poets” (Kirsopp Lake) favoured the idea that the scribes “usually destroyed their exemplars when they had copied the sacred books.”

““If Lake could believe this, why may not orthodox Christians believe that many ancient Byzantine manuscripts have been worn out with much copying and reading? And conversely, why may we not believe that B, Aleph and the other ancient non-Byzantine manuscripts have survived unto the present day simply because they were rejected by the Church and not used?””

White’s next target is Luke 2:14, where he disputes the AV1611’s “**good will toward men**” and thinks that the NIV’s “*men on whom his favour rests*” or similar as found in the NASV, is superior.

White’s opinion<sup>3 p 170</sup> is based on speculation by Metzger about the form of ‘the Greek,’ White seeks to bolster his opinion by reference to Beza’s ‘preference’ with respect to Luke 2:14 that Beza expressed in his notes but not in his Greek text.

White also takes advantage of another opportunity to attack Dr Mrs Riplinger, declaring that while Beza’s speculation about the reading ““(men) of good will”” consisted of “*textual criticism done on the basis of facts and evidence,*” Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citation<sup>14 p 232-3</sup> from Burgon<sup>13 p 421</sup>, of “*four [actually five, see below] corrupt fourth and fifth century MSS*” supporting the NIV, NASV readings versus “*53 ancient witnesses including 16 belonging to the second, third and fourth centuries and 37 from the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth centuries*” amounted to nothing but “[theories of] conspiracies and pre-judgement.”

See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks with respect to White’s criticism in **Chapter 4**, along with a detailed refutation of White’s speculations about Luke 2:14, including a summary<sup>8 p 68</sup> of the witnesses for and against the AV1611 reading. Added information follows.

Dr Moorman indicates<sup>9 p 27, 86</sup> that Families 1 and 13 are among the earlier textual witnesses in support of the AV1611 reading, i.e. at least contemporaneous with the texts of Codices 8 original reading i.e. Aleph original reading and B original reading, along with A, D and W – W having been discovered in 1906<sup>8 p 117</sup>, long after Burgon compiled his manuscript sources – that support the NIV reading “*men on whom his favour rests.*” The 12 extant Old Latin sources, including one with variation, Jerome’s Vulgate and few or none of the cursives support the NIV reading.

Dr Moorman notes, his underlining, that “*As with the angel’s pronouncement in Luke 1:32-33 this verse looks ultimately to Christ’s reign on earth at His Second Coming. That there will be complete peace on earth, though taught everywhere in Scripture, runs counter to “accepted” church teaching.*”

To the list of Fathers that Burgon cites in agreement with the AV1611’s reading “**good will toward men,**” Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 30, 44</sup> adds Tatian, in his Diatessaron on 170 AD, again



clearly predating the sources that Metzger and White appeal to in order to suppose that a shift in ‘the Greek’ from the so-called ‘original’ reading found in the modern texts to the (erroneously) supposed late reading as found in the AV1611.

(Dr Moorman cites Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>130 p 26</sup> (315-386 AD) as quoting the NIV, NASV reading on two occasions but Burgon reveals that this Father quoted the AV1611 reading for Luke 2:14 on at least one other occasion. See below.)

Dr Ruckman notes<sup>18 p 119-120</sup>, his emphases, “*Luke 2:14. According to Socrates (471-399 BC), Plato (422-347 BC), and Aristotle (384-322 BC), having a “good will” was the main thing in approaching life. One Greek philosopher emphasized it more than another; some considered it to be the “supreme good” (summum bonum). Proverbs 14:12 shows that a man can have the best will and intentions and still land flat in Hell. But the Greek philosophers didn’t believe that...when Origen & Co. hit Luke 2:14, they couldn’t help but put the pagan Greek philosophy of 200-400 BC back into the Bible. The correct reading, “peace on earth and good will to men,” has been altered to the fantastic philosophical homily, “and upon earth, peace among men of good will.”*”

Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 41-7, 340-1, 420-2, 131 p 21-2, 31-2</sup> carried out exhaustive research into the Traditional i.e. AV1611 reading “**good will toward men**” versus the NIV, NASV alternative. His findings are summarised as follows for the origin of the altered reading, his emphases.

First from *The Revision Revised*:

“A more grievous perversion of the truth of Scripture is scarcely to be found than occurs in the prosed revised exhibition of S. Luke ii. 14, in the Greek and English alike; for indeed not only is the proposed Greek text (*εν ανθρωποις ευδοκιας*) impossible [as found in Nestle], but the English of the Revisionists (‘peace among men in whom he is well pleased’) ‘can be arrived at’ (as one of themselves has justly remarked) ‘only through some process which would make any phrase bear almost any meaning the translator might like to put upon it’...Singular to relate, the addition of **a single final letter** (*ς*) has done all this mischief. Quite as singular is it that we should be able at the end of upwards of 1700 years to discover what occasioned its calamitous insertion. From the archetypal copy, by the aid of which the old Latin translation was made, (for the Latin copies all read ‘*pax hominibus bonae voluntatis,*’) the preposition *εν* was evidently taken away, - absorbed apparently by the *αν* which follows. In order therefore to make a sentence of some sort out of words which, without *εν*, are simply unintelligible, *ευδοκια* [“**good will**”] was turned into *ευδοκιας* [“of good will”]...”

Then from *The Causes of Corruption*:

“It is clear to me that in the earliest age of all (A.D. 100?) some copyist of *St. Luke 11. 14* (call him X) inadvertently omitted the second EN in the Angelic Hymn [the first is that which refers to “**Glory to God IN the highest**”]. Now if the persons (call them Y and Z) whose business it became in turn to reproduce the early copy thus inadvertently depraved, had but been content both of them to transcribe exactly what they saw before them, the error of their immediate predecessor (X) must infallibly have speedily been detected, remedied, and forgotten, — simply because, as every one must have seen as well as Y and Z, it was impossible to translate the sentence which results, — *επι γης εισηγη ανθρωποις ευδοκια*. Reference would have been made to any other copy of the third Gospel, and together with the omitted preposition (*εν*) sense would have been restored to the passage. But unhappily one of the two supposed Copyists being a learned grammarian who had no other copy at hand to refer to, undertook, good man that he was, proprio

*Marte [on his own initiative] to force a meaning into the manifestly corrupted text of the copy before him: and he did it by affixing to εὐδοκία the sign of the genitive case (ς). Unhappy effort of misplaced skill! That copy [or those copies] became the immediate progenitor [or progenitors] of a large family, — from which all the Latin copies are descended; whereby it comes to pass that Latin Christendom sings the Hymn ‘Gloria in excelsis’ incorrectly to the present hour, and may possibly sing it incorrectly to the end of time. The error committed by that same venerable Copyist survives in the four oldest copies of the passage extant, B\* and κ\* [i.e. the original drafts before alteration, as indicated by Dr Moorman. See **Chapter 4**], A and D, — though happily in no others [apart from W], — in the Old Latin, Vulgate, and Gothic, alone of Versions; in Irenaeus and Origen (who contradict themselves), and in the Latin Fathers. All the Greek authorities, with the few exceptions just recorded, of which A and D are the only consistent witnesses, unite in condemning the evident blunder.”*

Burgon adds the following comments.

*“We now come to the inattention of those long-since-forgotten 1st or 2nd century scribes who, beguiled by the similarity of the letters EN and AN (in the expression EN Ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία, St. Luke ii. 14), left out the preposition [i.e. EN or “in,” given as “**to-ward**” in the AV1611]. An unintelligible clause was the consequence, as has been explained above (p. 21): which some one next sought to remedy by adding to εὐδοκία the sign of the genitive (C) [i.e. as εὐδοκίας]. Thus the Old Latin translations were made.*

*“That this is the true history of a blunder which the latest Editors of the New Testament have mistaken for genuine Gospel, is I submit certain. Most Latin copies (except 14) exhibit ‘pax hominibus bonae voluntatis,’ as well as many Latin Fathers.*

*“On the other hand, the preposition EN is retained in every known Greek copy of St. Luke without exception, while the reading εὐδοκίας is absolutely limited to the four uncials ABκD [at the time of writing]. The witness of antiquity on this head is thus overwhelming and decisive.”*

Burgon states the following, his emphases, in *The Revision Revised* with respect to “the witness of antiquity,” the final passages being part of his reply to Bishop Ellicott. The discovery of Codex W subsequent to Burgon’s response does not affect the validity of the Dean’s conclusions.

*“Absolutely decisive of the true reading of the passage...ought to be the consideration that it is vouched for by every known copy of the Gospels of whatever sort, excepting only κ, A, B, D: the first and third of which, however, were anciently corrected and brought into conformity with the Received Text; while the second (A) is observed to be so inconsistent in its testimony, that...in another page of the same codex, and containing a quotation of S. Luke ii. 14, the correct reading of the place is found. D’s complicity in error is the less important because of the ascertained sympathy between that codex and the Latin. In the meantime the two Syriac Versions are a full set-off against the Latin copies; while the hostile evidence of the Gothic (which this time sides with the Latin) is more than neutralized by the unexpected desertion of the Coptic version from the opposite camp. The Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopic, Slavonic and Arabian versions, are besides all with the Received Text.”*

In addition to Families 1, 13, Dr Moorman lists 24-25 uncials; κ second corrector, B third corrector, E, G, H, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, Y, Γ, Δ, Θ, Λ, Xi, Ψ, Ω, 047, 053, 055, 0211, possibly 0233 and the majority of cursives in favour of the AV1611 reading and 3 definite Syriac witnesses to the AV1611 reading; the Peshitta, embodying a 2<sup>nd</sup> century text,

the Sinaitic and the Harclean, from the 7<sup>th</sup> century and favouring the AV1611 against the NIV approximately 3:1, like the Peshitta. The Sinaitic Syriac manuscript<sup>9 p 33-5, 39</sup> was “discovered in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.” It was first thought to embody a 2<sup>nd</sup> century text but contemporary scholars, including Metzger, have since assigned it to the 4<sup>th</sup> century, although according to Dr Hills<sup>65 p 174</sup>, the Sinaitic Syriac has also been assigned “an early 3<sup>rd</sup>-century date.” Dr Hills indicates that according to one scholar, “not infrequently” this manuscript agreed with the Traditional Text against the Western and Alexandrian texts.” The Sinaitic Syriac is extant only in the Gospels, where, according to Dr Moorman it supports the AV1611 on 55 occasions and the NIV on 81, effectively in agreement with Dr Hills’s comment.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has “men of good will,” similar to the NIV reading, Tyndale<sup>47</sup> has “unto men rejoicing,” which is closer to the AV1611 reading than that of the NIV, Geneva<sup>49</sup> has “towards men good will,” Bishops<sup>138</sup> has “unto men a good will,” essentially in agreement with the AV1611.

It would appear that the Peshitta and the Sinaitic Syriac are the versions to which Burgon has referred above. However, in the light of later examination, the Sinaitic Syriac should be reckoned as a 4<sup>th</sup> century, rather than a 2<sup>nd</sup> century witness (to be conservative) and the evidence listed in this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 68</sup> amended in order to reflect this finding.

But again, as with the discovery of one additional uncial codex, W to set against the “many hundreds” supporting the AV1611 reading, Burgon’s evaluation is clearly not materially affected by the later date that should be assigned to the Sinaitic Syriac. He continues, his emphases.

*“The traditional reading of S. Luke ii. 14 is vouched for by every known copy of the Gospels but four – 3 of which are of extremely bad character, viz. Ⲙ, B, D. The Versions are divided: but not the Fathers: of whom more than forty-seven from every part of ancient Christendom, - (Syria, Palestine, Alexandria, Asia Minor, Cyprus, Crete, Gaul,) – come back to attest that the traditional reading (as usual) is the true one. Yet such is the infatuation of the new school, that Drs Westcott and Hort [and James White] are content to make nonsense of the Angelic Hymn on the night of the Nativity, rather than admit the possibility of complicity in error of Ⲙ, B, D: error in respect of a single letter! The Reader is advised to refer to what has already been offered on this subject, from p. 41 to p. 47.”*

This is sound advice that James White should have taken - and the late Bruce Metzger, his scholarly grasp of Greek notwithstanding.

The wide geographical area of the Patristic witnesses to the AV1611 reading should be noted, in addition to their considerable number. It clearly strengthens the Fathers’ evidence in support of the AV1611.

Burgon continues, in response to Bishop Ellicott, with respect to the Patristic evidence in support of the AV1611’s reading in Luke 2:14.

*“Finding that you challenge the Received reading of S. Luke ii. 14, (‘good will toward men’); - and that, (on the authority of 4 Greek Codices [Ⲙ, A, B, D], all Latin documents and the Gothic Version,) you contend that ‘peace among men in whom he is well pleased’ ought to be read, instead; - I make my appeal unreservedly to ANTIQUITY. I request the Ancients to adjudicate between you and me by favouring us with their verdict. Accordingly, I find as follows:*

*“That, in the II<sup>nd</sup> century, - the [Peshitta Syriac Version – see remarks above] and Irenaeus support the Received Text:*

*“That, in the III<sup>rd</sup> century, - the Coptic Version, - Origen in 3 places, and the Apostolical Constitutions in 2, do the same:*

*“That, in the IV<sup>th</sup> century, (to which century, you are invited to remember, **codices B and ̈** belong,) – Eusebius, - Aphraates the Persian, - Titus of Bostra, - each in 2 places:- Didymus in 3:- Gregory of Nazianzus, - Cyril of Jerusalem, - Epiphanius 2 – and Gregory of Nyssa – 4 times: Ephraem Syr., - Philo bp. Of Carpasus, - Chrysostom 9 times, - and an unknown Antiochian contemporary of his:- these eleven [named], I once more find, are **every one against you...***

*“Thus I have enumerated **fifty-three** ancient Greek authorities, of which **sixteen** belong to the II<sup>nd</sup>, III<sup>rd</sup>, and IV<sup>th</sup> centuries: and **thirty-seven** to the V<sup>th</sup>, VI<sup>th</sup>, VII<sup>th</sup>, and VIII<sup>th</sup>.*

*“And now, which of us two is found to have made the fairer and fuller appeal to ‘the consentient testimony of the most ancient authorities:’ you or **I?**... This first.*

*“And next, since the foregoing 53 names belong to some of the most famous personages in Ecclesiastical antiquity: are dotted over every region of ancient Christendom: in many instances are **far more ancient than codices B and ̈**:- with what show of reason will you pretend that the evidence concerning S. Luke ii. 14 “**clearly preponderates**” in favour of the reading which you and your friends prefer?”*

Bishop Ellicott could never respond adequately. Neither could James White, although in attacking Dr Mrs Riplinger as he does – see above – he tacitly dismisses Dean Burgon’s researches in the same way, as “[theories of] conspiracies and prejudgement.” The “prejudgement,” or prejudice, lies with James White.

White<sup>3 p 170-3, 261-2</sup> holds up the AV1611 reading “**believeth on me**” in John 6:47, where NIV, NASV omit “**on me**” as an example of a “double standard” on the part of bible believers because “serious charges of “tampering with the Gospel” are lodged against all translations that would not include this later addition to the text.”

White quotes from Donald Waite<sup>23 p 158</sup>, who states that, his emphases, “To make salvation only a matter of “**believing**” rather than solely, as Christ said in this verse, “**believing on ME,**” is truly “**ANOTHER GOSPEL!**...”

White disputes Dr Waite’s conclusion by alluding to John 6:35, 6:40 in the NASV, which reads respectively “he who believes in Me shall never thirst” and “everyone who...believes in Him, may have eternal life.” He then maintains that, his emphasis, “we have to wonder why the modern versions would seek to hide faith in Christ in John 6:47 and not do the same thing only twelve verses earlier. Quite seriously, could anyone read John 6:35 through 6:47 and **not** know what the object of faith in verse 47 is to be? One would have to be a very poor reader not to understand what the Lord is talking about.”

To justify further his efforts to delete the words “**on me**” from John 6:47, White alludes to John 7:38, 11:25-26, 12:44, 46 in the NASV, all of which contain the phrase “believes in me” and therefore declares that “the entire idea that the modern translations have some doctrinal impurity for not having “in Me” falls flat upon the most basic examination.”

He then accuses the AV1611 of “not always” defining “the object of faith” with reference to Mark 9:23, Romans 1:16, 10:4, 1 Corinthians 7:12 and concludes, his emphasis, that “It is hard to understand how anyone could possibly look at John 6:47 and seriously

*think that there is some malevolent purpose behind the reading in the modern translations. Surely the information as to why “in Me” is not found in the NASB and NIV is easily obtainable.”*

But White has not produced “*the information.*” In Part Two of his book, he lists the few corrupt sources that omit these words and asserts that, “*The conjugation of P66 and P75 together with 8 and B, together with the internal evidence, is more than sufficient to substantiate the reading\*. The phrase [“He that believeth on me”] is classically Johannine in style (John 6:35, 7:38, 11:25, etc.). Therefore a shift to “regular” phrasing is to be expected.*”

\*White means the omission of “*on me,*” which is of course not a reading but a deletion. As Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 220</sup> rightly observes, his emphasis, “*An omission is not a “variant.”*”

But none of this amounts to *a reason why* the words are omitted from the modern versions, or indeed from the handful of sources that underlie them.

White has only concocted an excuse for omitting the words “*on me*” from John 6:47 based on their occurrence elsewhere in the Gospel of John and his accusation that the AV1611 supposedly doesn’t always define “*the object of faith.*”

He closes his comments on John 6:47 with a further accusation against bible believers, his emphasis.

*“KJV Only advocates do not address this, but rather focus attention upon an issue that is, in fact, self-contradictory: the idea that if you don’t define the object of faith in every instance, you are somehow opening the door to all kinds of problems, even though the KJV does the same thing in many other places. This is a classic example of the use of a double standard. Here KJV Only advocates are found misusing the Gospel message itself to enlist people to their side. Frightening people into thinking the modern versions are somehow attacking faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.”*

White’s comments are “*a classic case*” of obfuscation and distortion.

Tischendorf<sup>62</sup> deleted “*on me*” from John 6:47, to be followed by Westcott and Hort, who deleted the words from the RV and Nestle. Tregelles and Alford regard the words as ‘doubtful.’

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 104</sup> lists P66 as omitting “*on me*” in John 6:47 but not P75. Even if P75 is reckoned as also omitting the words, it makes little difference to the huge imbalance of sources for and against the AV1611.

Only a few sources are in agreement with P66. They are almost all Greek old uncials and consist of 8, B, C original text, L, T, W, Θ. One Old Latin source omits the words. Codex C has a ‘second corrector’ who has inserted the words missing in the original draft, such that 22-23 uncials have the words; A, C second corrector, D, E, F, G, H, K, S, U, V, Y, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, Ψ, Ω, 047, 055, 0141, 0211 and possibly 0233 along with almost all of the cursives and Family 13. 10 of the 11 extant Old Latin sources, Jerome’s Vulgate and the Peshitta Syriac also agree with the AV1611 and so does Tatian’s Diatessaron<sup>130 p 49</sup>.

The Diatessaron<sup>9 p 17, 52</sup> is as old as P66 – and P75 – as are the texts of the Peshitta and the Old Latin<sup>8 p 5, 19 p 98</sup> even though the manuscripts are from the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and later centuries<sup>9 p 29, 33</sup>. Both versions suffered at the hands of ‘correctors’ – in the direction of Alexandria<sup>18 p 77-9</sup>. The early papyri very likely suffered the same fate. See Pickering’s evaluation above and in *Chapter 3*, which points strongly to the conclusion that P66, P75 etc. are actually early corruptions of the Traditional Text as preserved and refined in the AV1611.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops<sup>138</sup> agree with the AV1611's "**on me**" in John 6:47 (Wycliffe, Geneva, Bishops' have "*in me*"), these witnesses thereby testifying to a particularly well-preserved lineage of the Traditional Text in this verse.

The pre-350 AD Gothic, as Moorman confirms and pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bibles have "**on me**" in John 6:47, in agreement with the AV1611. See *Appendix, Table A16*.

So White is wrong to dismiss the words as "*this later addition.*" The words are scripture, faithfully preserved in the AV1611 and with an unbroken tradition of extant witnesses reaching back almost to apostolic times so White's attempts to justify their omission are irrelevant.

However, he misses the subtlety of the omission in John 6:47. The answer to his rhetorical question "*Quite seriously, could anyone read John 6:35 through 6:47 and not know what the object of faith in verse 47 is to be?*" depends not on the reading skill of whoever is reading the passage, but on his belief system.

Because, regardless of White's attempts to justify its omission in the modern versions, "*the object of faith*" is *not* defined in the NASV, NIV renderings of verse 47 and therefore is open to interpretation.

A professing Christian *may* read John 6:47 in the manner that White suggests but a New Ager *may not*. A New Ager may allow that since the New Testament is 'Christian sacred literature,' John 6 may have an emphasis on believing in the Lord Jesus Christ for eternal life but the form of verse 47 as found in the modern translations nevertheless allows for an alternative "*object of faith,*" e.g. New Age doctrine.

An unbeliever reading John 6 could, therefore, think he is faced with a choice on reaching verse 47 and may make the *wrong* choice if a New Ager is at hand to influence him or if a Catholic is close by to push him in the direction of (un)holy 'Mother Church' and the sacraments.

In support of this conclusion, it should be noted that Pope Benedict XVI has recently issued a document<sup>139</sup>, this author's emphasis, that "*restates key sections of a 2000 document the pope wrote when he was prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith [i.e. the Inquisition], "Dominus Iesus," which set off a firestorm of criticism among Protestant and other Christian denominations because it said they were not true churches but merely ecclesial communities and therefore did not have the "means of salvation."*"

The NASV, NIV and James White effectively endorse this latest outpouring of papal dogma. The AV1611 does not.

This is the inherent danger in the omission of "**on me**" in John 6:47 that White's speculative reassurances don't cover. John 6:47 is one of many verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 259ff</sup> has identified where the modern versions make serious omissions that allow for New Age doctrine, in addition to Christian doctrine with respect to salvation. She states, her emphases, "***The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world (1 John 4:14). In the New Age however, "a God, one of many, sends a son or avatar, with a message, to be a saviour, for each age. Once again, the new versions line up with the goats on the left."***"

White either evades or only superficially discusses the following verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists with John 6:47. The NIV, NASV or both omit or alter the underlined words.

Mark 9:42

***"And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea."***

Both the early printed 1977 and current online versions of White's NASV and Nestle omit "*in me*," based only on Tischendorf<sup>62</sup>. Even the RV and NIV, printed 1979 and current online versions, retain the words.

John 3:15 "***That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.***"

The NASV, both versions, alter the underlined clause to "*whoever believes will [1977 Edition, "may"] in Him have eternal life.*" The 1979 NIV has "*that everyone who believes may have eternal life in him.*" The online NIV, Nestle and the pre-Westcott and Hort Greek editors agree with the AV1611 but the RV reads as the NASV.

Acts 22:16

***"And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."***

The RV, Nestle, NASV, both versions, NIV, both versions, all have "*his name*" or "*His name.*" Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> each have "*his name*," clearly influencing Westcott and Hort and their RV. White<sup>3 p 176</sup> says of the AV1611 reading that "*it is probably secondary*" but "*should at the very least be noted for the sake of all those who wish to do textual studies.*"

The reading is certainly *not* secondary and most certainly should be noted for the sake of all those believe in God's preservation of His words. The verse will be addressed in more detail later.

Romans 1:16

***"For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."***

The RV, Nestle, NASV, both versions, NIV, both versions, omit "*of Christ.*" Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> likewise each omit the words. White<sup>3 p 176</sup> assures his readers that "*the modern versions are following the most ancient manuscripts while recognising the tendency toward expansion that is found in the Byzantine manuscripts [unproven by White or anyone else].*" He is confident that because "*the phrase "the gospel of Christ" ...appears eight times in the NIV [and NASV] translation of the New Testament [the actual "New Testament" between two covers remains unidentified]...again there is no logical reason to impute evil motives to these translations.*"

The expression "*the gospel of Christ*" occurs 11 times in the New Testament; Romans 1:16, 15:19, 29 – see below, 1 Corinthians 9:12, 18, 2 Corinthians 4:4, 9:13, 10:14, Galatians 1:7, Philippians 1:27, 1 Thessalonians 3:2. In addition to the omission in Romans 1:16, the NIV, NASV omit "*of the gospel*" in Romans 15:29. They also alter "*the glorious gospel of Christ*" to the obscure expression "*the gospel of the glory of Christ*" in 2 Corinthians 4:4.

White therefore fails to inform his readers that the modern translators removed or altered over a quarter of the references to this phrase in the New Testament, including to 2 of its 3 occurrences the Book of Romans, the central Book in the New Testament on Christian salvation. Whatever the motives of the modern translators, the *results* of their motives are certainly evil.

Romans 15:29

***“And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.”***

The RV, Nestle, NASV, both versions, NIV, both versions, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit the words ***“of the gospel.”*** White<sup>3</sup> p 178 maintains that *“Many scholars would say that the later reading is an expansion but there is another possibility that...the phrase “of the gospel” could have been accidentally skipped over early on.”*

Note that White still thinks the AV1611 reading is *“the later reading”* even though he pretends to be even handed. The AV1611 reading is not *“later”* and is discussed below.

Galatians 6:15

***“For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.”***

The RV, Nestle, NASV, both versions, NIV, both versions, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford<sup>62</sup> omit the words ***“of the gospel.”***

Ephesians 1:11

***“In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:”***

The RV, Nestle and the other Greek texts retain ***“in whom,”*** although Lachmann changes *“we have obtained an inheritance”* to a weaker reading *“we were called,”* reflected in the NIV’s *“In him we were also chosen,”* for both versions.

The RV has a strange but similar reading *“we were made a heritage”* and Nestle has *“we were chosen as [his] inheritance.”* Dr Ruckman<sup>17</sup> p 214 indicates that the Jesuits introduced this alteration in 1582 and the DR Challoner’s Revision reads *“In whom we also were called by lot.”* The JB has *“And it is in him that we were claimed as God’s own.”* The NWT has a better reading, *“in union with whom we were also assigned as heirs”* although by inspection it is nevertheless weaker than the AV1611 reading.

The NASV, both versions, has *“In Him also we have obtained an inheritance.”*

The modern versions either obscure the Christian’s assurance of an inheritance or weaken the AV1611’s direct link with ***“in Christ”*** in verse 10, or both, as the NIV does, allowing for a New Age interpretation of another possible *“avatar”* to fulfill the designation *“In Him.”*

Ephesians 1:13

***“In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise.”***

The word ***“trusted”*** is in italics, so it is not found in the Greek texts but RV and NASV, both versions, also omit ***“trusted,”*** leading to an ungrammatical expression which has a subject *“you”* without a verb and removing the verse’s self-interpretation of ***“ye believed”*** as ***“ye also trusted”*** in the Lord Jesus Christ, verse 12, for salvation.

The NIV, both versions, has a misleading paraphrase *“you also were included in Christ when you heard the word of truth,”* wrongly implying an automatic salvation on hearing the Gospel - no doubt for Edwin Palmer’s ‘elect’<sup>14</sup> p 231. The removal of ***“in whom”*** on both occasions in verse 13 by the NASV, NIV, again allows for a New Age interpretation of another avatar to be identified as *“Him.”*



The above list contains no fewer than 9 serious omissions or alterations in the modern versions, including John 6:47, that obscure or weaken New Testament doctrine on individual salvation and allow for a leavening of New Age corruption in the scriptures. As indicated, Dr Mrs Riplinger has identified many more.

Again, White forgot that *“a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump”* 1 Corinthians 5:6b. See remarks in **Chapter 3**.

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 181-8</sup> has these incisive comments, his emphases.

*“Donald Waite, a champion for the TR, called White’s attention to the fact that by omitting “me” from John 6:47, someone (the NASV) had made a bad theological error, for the passage was telling a sinner ON WHOM to believe in order to get everlasting life. White immediately rushes to the defence of the heretical reading (NASV) hoping the sinner will just believe on something, and get eternal life. His alibi<sup>3 p 40</sup> is “no textual variants...materially disrupt or destroy any essential doctrine of the Christian faith.””*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 434</sup> says this about White’s “alibi,” his emphases.

*“White<sup>3 p 213, 196, 162</sup> words it like this: “None of these passages IMPACT the plain witness to the doctrine.” “There is no conspiracy on the part of the Modern Greek Texts [x, B, D, etc.; the trash basket kids] to hide or downplay the deity of the Lord Jesus.” “The NIV and ALL THE OTHERS presented the Gospel with clarity EQUAL to or BETTER than the KJV itself.” So all of them combined get less than one tenth the results of the AV.”*

White’s willingness in his book to address the results of the AV1611 versus the modern versions is conspicuous by its absence.

See also Cloud’s remarks<sup>6 Part 3</sup> in **Chapter 3**.

As David Daniels<sup>43 p 133-5</sup> rightly observes – see again **Chapter 3** – *“Modern Bibles take away many places where God says the same thing again. Thus modern Bibles make it look like those doctrines weren’t so important to God.”*

Dr Ruckman continues.

*“What does James White say about a sinner getting saved by believing on nothing? The explanation is that “an object of faith” can be omitted, because no object is found in the AV in Romans 1:16, 10:4; Mark 9:23; and 1 Corinthians 7:12...not one verse he cited has anything in it to do with ANYONE getting eternal life by believing anything.*

*“All four verses were dodges [but]...“The OBJECT of faith” is found in three of them. And in the only one where it is omitted (1 Cor. 7:12), you will find “brother,” which refers to a “brother” IN CHRIST (as elsewhere in all of the Pauline Epistles); and note “sister” in the same passage (vs. 15). Obviously, the wife who “believes not” is an unbeliever who is not “in Christ”...*

*“In Mark, the object was given and defined; he was to believe his prayer would be answered. In Romans 1:16, the object was identified; it was “the gospel,” and in Romans 10:4 the object was right in the verse (“Christ”). The Holy Spirit gave the objects in all three passages in Third Grade English. Being unable to read Third Grade English, White pretended that a word has to immediately follow a verb, or else the “object” is not there...*

*“But John 6:47 was something entirely different from these excursions into “objects” (direct or indirect), and the contents of the four passages cited. John 6:47 were words spoken by Jesus Christ telling unsaved sinners how to get everlasting life. In John 6:47, in*

the NASV, there is no object (direct or indirect), found anywhere in the verse, or even identified or **suggested**: it is missing from the beginning, the middle, and the end to produce this totally **non-Biblical Satanic teaching**: “Truly, truly he who believes has eternal life.”

“**No, he doesn’t**. No man is saved by believing (Acts 16:30-31), not even believing in **God** (James 2:19).

“Little Jimmy, in his zeal to sell modern versions, just justified a **Satanic lie**...”

“Wolves bleat like sheep; **they can kill more sheep that way**. We should not be surprised to see Mr White accusing “King James Only advocates” of “misusing the Gospel message itself to enlist people to their side. Frightening people into thinking the modern versions are somehow attacking faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.”

“That was his comment after justifying two of the most heretical, dangerous, **Satanic omissions in Scripture** (NIV and NASV on John 6:47). We are “misusing the Gospel message.” White doesn’t even know what the “gospel message” is. If anyone did frighten anyone into throwing an ASV or NIV or NASV out the window, what in heaven would that have to do with “misusing the Gospel message” (1 Cor. 15:1-5; Gal. 1:8-10)? **Nothing**...

“Who, **actually**, not only “misused the Gospel message” but **destroyed** it in John 6:47? Did you ask? It was...**⌘**, **B**, and **P66**. And what bunch of turkeys bowed down to these corruptions in order to keep a sinner from believing on the one who spoke those words? White’s **buddies**, that’s who.”

Dr Ruckman inserts a quote from Dean Burgon<sup>140</sup>, which has been expanded to show once again, how genuine biblical scholarship differs greatly from the poor substitute prof-fered by James White.

““No progress is possible in the department of ‘Textual Criticism’ until the superstition for we are persuaded that it is nothing less which at present prevails concerning certain of ‘the old uncials’ (as they are called) has been abandoned. By ‘the old uncials’ are generally meant, [1] The Vatican Codex (**B**), and [2] the Sinaitic Codex (**⌘**), which by common consent are assigned to the fourth century: [3] the Alexandrian (**A**), and [4] the Cod. Ephraemi rescriptus (**C**), which are given to the fifth century: and [5] the Codex Bezae (**D**), which is claimed for the sixth century: to which must now be added [6] the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (**Ⓢ**), at the end of the fifth, and [7] the Codex Rossanensis (**Ⓢ**), at the beginning of the sixth century. Five of these seven Codexes for some unexplained reason, although the latest of them (**D**) is sundered from the great bulk of the copies, uncial and cursive, by about as many centuries as the earliest of them (**B** **⌘**) are sundered from the last of their group, have been invested with oracular authority and are supposed to be the vehicles of imperial decrees. It is pretended that what is found in either **B** or in **⌘** or in **D**, although unsupported by any other manuscript, may reasonably be claimed to exhibit the truth of scripture, in defiance of the combined evidence of all other documents to the contrary. Let a reading be advocated by **B** and **⌘** in conjunction, and it is assumed as a matter of course that such evidence must needs outweigh the combined evidence of all other MSS. which can be named. But when (as often happens) three or four of these ‘old uncials’ are in accord, especially if (as is not unfrequently the case) they have the support of a single ancient version (as the Bohairic), or a solitary early Father (as Origen), it seems to be deemed axiomatic that such evidence must needs carry all before it.

““I maintain the contradictory proposition, and am prepared to prove it. I insist that readings so supported are clearly untrustworthy and may be dismissed as certainly unauthentic.””

It is a pity that White has not studied Dean Burgon’s analyses in any detail. Such a study would have saved him a lot of wasted effort.

Dr Ruckman continues.

“In trying to deceive a sinner on how **to be saved**, White bet on two of the foulest Greek texts in existence and then had the gall to accuse Bible believers of “misusing the Gospel message” when they identified the dirty scoundrels who printed the reading: or (more properly) refused to give ANY reading, although the **right reading** was there. Note! All Scholarship Only advocates think that they and their friends are being “vilified” when they are clearly being **identified**...

“Now look what happens when we adopt one of Hort’s canons of criticism, which he swore was valid. This one says: “we should choose the reading that best suits the style of the reader”... We will pretend that **this** one is valid. (Whereupon White and the White-Wash crew will have to pretend [this time!] that it is **invalid**.)

“John’s “style” is so obvious (along with his statement of purpose: John 20:31) that no one but a Scholarship Only advocate could miss it. OBSERVE: [in John 7:38, 11:25, 26, 12:44, 46, 14:12] the “EME” [in each of the above verses] is “**ME**.” Jesus Christ used the expression eight times in the Gospel of John, but you are to believe...that **He forgot it one time** in John 6:47, in a discourse on the Bread of Life (John 6:35). He, Himself was a speaker in all **eight cases**...

“The reading of the **King James Bible** is not only the Majority Text (M), found in the vast (majority) of Greek manuscripts, but it is cited in the Didache, which was written more than 180 years **before B or N**: “**HE THAT BELIEVETH ON ME**.” How could a “superb, accurate” scholar fail to tell you about this material? And especially if he was a “godly” scholar?”

Upon citing the first five of the verses in the Gospel of John that Dr Ruckman lists as containing “eme” or “me,” White insists – see above - that, “the entire idea that the modern translations have some doctrinal impurity for not having “in Me” falls flat upon the most basic examination.”

It is White’s conclusion that “falls flat” in the light of Dr Ruckman’s observation above. John 6:47 is the most emphatic statement in all 6 verses from John, or in all 7 if John 6:35 is included, about having everlasting life from the moment of believing on the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation.

“**Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.**”

For the NIV, NASV and James White to omit the vital condition of “**on me**” exclusively with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ for everlasting life is more than “some doctrinal impurity.” It is a travesty.

White<sup>3 p 173-4</sup> now goes to extraordinary lengths to justify the NASV reading “I do not go up to this feast” versus the AV1611 reading “**I go not yet up unto this feast**” in John 7:8. John 7:10 shows that the Lord did go up to the feast and the NASV therefore makes the Lord Jesus Christ out to be a liar.

But White declares that, his emphasis, “there is a perfectly logical explanation of the NASB’s reading that does not involve the Lord Jesus in dishonesty. When saying that He

*was not going up to the feast, this should be understood as referring to the public procession to Jerusalem that was part of the regular celebration...The Lord indicates that He is not going up **openly** because His time is not yet come. However, He does then go up to the feast, but “secretly” as the NASB says, not openly and publicly. Hence the reading of the NASV does not involve Jesus in dishonesty if it is understood properly.”*

However, White cannot overlook “*the awesome array of witnesses*” in support of the AV1611, which he lists and he is therefore forced to opt for a compromise position, when he concludes that “*given that the reading of “not yet” is a strong possibility, and that the reading “not” does not necessitate any dishonesty on the Lord’s part, we see yet again that the modern texts do not denigrate the Lord Jesus.*”

White is attempting to defend the indefensible. The Lord did not say that He was not going up to the feast “*openly*,” though the expression “***not openly***” is found in verse 10, He said “***I go not up yet.***”

The Lord also said, “***I go not up yet unto this feast,***” not “*unto this public procession.*”

White’s insistence that the verse “*should be understood as referring to the public procession*” is therefore a wholly illegitimate recourse to interpretation in an effort to cast doubt on the textual evidence in support of the AV1611 reading, obviously in order to promote the NASV – for which he is or was a hired revision consultant. See **Chapter 3**.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 105</sup> shows that in addition to the majority of cursive manuscripts, both P66 and P75, along with 29-30 uncials; B, E, F, G, H, K, L, N, S, T, U, V, W, X, Y, Γ, Δ, Θ, Λ, Ψ, Ω, 047, 055, 070, 0105, 0141 0180, 0211, 0250, possibly 0233 and Families 1, 13 all support the AV1611 reading. The Syriac Peshitta and 3 of the 11 extant Old Latin sources and the pre-350 AD Gothic likewise have “***not...yet.***”

The main witnesses in support of the NASV are ⳨, D, K, M, Π, some of the cursives, the greater number of extant Old Latin sources and Jerome’s Vulgate – which may explain why Wycliffe’s New Testament<sup>46</sup> also agrees with the NASV. Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops<sup>138</sup> support the AV1611 but so do the RV and the NIV. Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>62</sup> have the reading “*I am not going up*” and their texts no doubt influenced Nestle and in turn the NASV but not Westcott and Hort on this occasion, because Codex B happens to agree with the AV1611.

Dr Moorman succinctly cuts through White’s obfuscation. “*The removal of “yet” makes our Lord to speak untruth.*”

White seizes on Acts 4:25 as “*a variant that is not normally cited in KJV Only material*” because where the AV1611 has “***Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said***” the RV, Nestle, NASV, NIV have “*You spoke by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of your servant, our father David*” or similar.

He states that, “*Here we find the unusual situation of the modern texts, following the most ancient manuscripts, including a reading that has fallen out of the majority of Greek manuscripts*” and asserts in triumph that the phrase “*by the Holy Spirit*” “*is not only eminently orthodox, it is theologically significant as well...an important verification of the role of the Holy Spirit in the in the inspiration of the writings of David in the Old Testament.*” White<sup>3 p 190</sup> gives the sources of the phrase as “*P74, ⳨, A, B, D, E, Ψ and many others.*” “*Many others,*” however, as even White is forced to admit, does not include the majority, so once again, White is clearly basing his suppositions about Acts 4:25 on the old, corrupt uncials.

He thinks that “KJV only” writers should “*embrace such a reading with joy*” and seems mystified that “*such is not the case*” but he asserts that the reading “*is not cited, perhaps, because it raises a point that KJV Only literature does not wish to admit: even on the basis of their own standards, there are places where the modern texts are theologically superior to the KJV.*”

White omits to mention that the words “*our father*” has also apparently “*fallen out of the majority of Greek manuscripts.*”

Together with the modern versions listed above, the DR, JR has the additions “*by the Holy Spirit*” and “*our father*” in Acts 4:25. See **Appendix, Table A1**. All these versions, including the latest online versions of the NIV, NASV, agree with the departures from the AV1611 in Acts that White quotes in this section of his chapter; Acts 4:25, 16:7, 22:16. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>62</sup> add “*by the Holy Spirit*” and “*our father*” in Acts 4:25, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> add “*of Jesus*” in Acts 16:7 and alter “***the name of the Lord***” to “*his name*” in Acts 22:16. The occurrence of these additions and alterations in the Douay-Rheims New Testament may explain why they are also found in Wycliffe’s New Testament<sup>46</sup>, because the DR comes originally from Jerome’s Vulgate and Wycliffe may have used a copy of the Old Latin which Jerome had corrupted, or later edits may have been introduced to conform Wycliffe’s New Testament to the Vulgate of Jerome. See Dr Ruckman’s comment<sup>33 p 98-9</sup> in **Chapter 4**.

“Any “*Old Itala*” would have been the right “*Old Latin*” BEFORE JEROME MESSED WITH IT.”

Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops<sup>138</sup> agree with the AV1611 in Acts 4:25, 16:7, 22:16, thereby indicating the unbroken witness to these verses as they stand in the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.

In other words, the modern texts are not “*theologically superior to the KJV*” and the additional phrases found in their renditions of Acts 4:25 are not found in the AV1611 because they are not part of “***the holy scriptures***” 2 Timothy 3:15. See this author’s summary<sup>8 p 154-5</sup>.

“**Acts 4:25** “*by the Holy Spirit*” and “*our father*” referring to David, or similar, is added by NIV, JB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A.

“*The additions detract from the nature of the Godhead, Romans 1:20.*”

“*Although the Bible says that “God...hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son” Hebrews 1:2, as He did “by the prophets”, verse 1, nowhere does the Bible say that God “speaks” by the Holy Spirit because God speaking IS the Holy Spirit speaking! Isaiah 6:8,9 says “I heard the voice of the Lord, saying...Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not;”. Yet when Paul quotes this passage in Acts 28:25-26, he says “Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand;”*”

“*Moreover, when Agabus speaks in Acts 21:11, he says “Thus saith the Holy Ghost,” instead of “Thus saith the Lord,” which is used for prophetic utterances over 200 times in the Old Testament. Further, Acts 1:16 shows that it was in the Person of the Holy Ghost that God spoke through David. 2 Samuel 23:2, 3 makes this clear:*

“***“The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.”***”

*“The words of the Spirit of the Lord and the God of Israel are one and the same - because the Spirit of the Lord and the God of Israel are one and the same, even though distinct Persons of the Godhead. The Holy Spirit is not merely an intermediary through whom God speaks, as the addition in the NIV etc. implies.*

*“The addition of “our father” to Acts 4:25 is inappropriate because the apostles are PRAYING and the Lord taught them to pray! See Matthew 6:9, Luke 11:2.*

*““Now the Lord is that Spirit” 2 Corinthians 3:17.*

*“Our critic here shows that he is rather inconsistent in two respects. First, he criticises the AV1611 for supposedly omitting a phrase which has “a bearing on important doctrine.” Yet he strenuously objects to the same criticism being applied to the NIV in its omissions or distortions of 1 John 5:7, 1 Timothy 3:16 and Acts 8:37 on the grounds that the doctrines embodied in these verses “(are) taught repeatedly in the N.T.”. See Chapter 14, “Disputed Texts(?)” where our critic’s objections to these verses will be answered.*

*“Second, he regards the addition of “by the Holy Spirit” in the NIV etc. as being important for the particular doctrine of “the work of the Holy Spirit in inspiration.” Yet he fails to criticise the NIV for having removed the word “inspiration” from each of the only two places in the Bible where it occurs, namely Job 32:8 and 2 Timothy 3:16.”*

James White exhibits similar inconsistency. Dr Ruckman comments further<sup>88 p 184-5</sup>, his emphases.

*“Where do these words [“by the Holy Spirit”] come from? They will be found in the official ROMAN CATHOLIC Bible, published by the JESUIT PRIESTS in 1582...This addition...is found in Aleph, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus, the great leavened corruptions used by modern Christian Schools to correct the Holy Bible.*

*“Now, students who have carefully checked out passages like Mark 9:44, Matthew 6:13, and Luke 24:52, are familiar with the old sing-song about “the passage has CREPT in” from another place (see comments on Acts 9:5). Yet, here, with a perfect example of Acts 1:16 [“which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake”] “creeping” into the Alexandrian corruptions via the “LXX,” what do [A. T.] Robertson [etc.] say? Nothing: absolutely **nothing**. They accept the phenomenon **this time** because it runs **contrary to the Authorised Text**; any other time it would have “crept in.””*

Thus, according to James White, the phrase “dropped out” of the majority of manuscripts underlying the AV1611, when on other occasions e.g. with respect to Mark 9:44 in the AV1611, a phrase<sup>3 p 157</sup> “has been inserted in later manuscripts” or, e.g. with respect to Matthew 6:13 in the AV1611, a reading is an example<sup>3 p 252</sup> of “how scribal expansion took place” or, e.g. with respect to Romans 11:6, a reading is an (always unsubstantiated) example<sup>3 p 43, 46, 153, 177</sup> of “an expansion of piety.”

Anything to denigrate the AV1611, even though White runs the risk of being thought ‘inconsistent.’

Dr Ruckman continues, his emphases, with a searching explanation of how the addition of “our father” to Acts 4:25 is anything but, in the words of James White, “eminently orthodox.”

*“”This reading [“our father”] (found in Aleph, E, A, B) forced the scribe to translate paida (vs 27) as “servant,” for if he translated it as “child” (AV1611) it would have col-*

*lided with the wrong father- David!...By referring to David as "our father"...the word "child" had to be altered to "servant" to avoid the confusion...*

*"However, the greatest testimony of the Holy Spirit against the corrupt reading...is the fact that David is never referred to as "our father" anywhere in the Bible. David is called:*

*"1. A **Patriarch** (Acts 2:29).*

*"2. **God's servant** (Psalm 132:10)*

*"3. **"My father"** (2 Chronicles 2:3 – Solomon speaking)*

*"4. **"His father"** (2 Chronicles 28:1 – Solomon's father).*

*"But where the expression **"OUR FATHER"** occurs (Acts 7:2, 38) David is separated from the expression. The human "our father" of Israel was Abraham – not David. (See Matthew 3:9, Luke 3:8, 16:24, John 8:33, 56, Acts 7:2, 32, Romans 4:1, 2, 3, 4, 9, Galatians 3:6, 7, 8, 9 etc.)*

*"The NASV, therefore, with its Catholic counterpart – the Jesuit **Rheims** of the Vatican (1582) – is to be ignored, and the words "our father" are to be stricken out of these corrupt Bibles, even if they are found in every translation, every commentary, and every Greek text in the last 100 years. The King James Bible is correct."*

And once again, James White has been unable to prove otherwise.

He now moves to Acts 16:7, in defence of the modern reading "Spirit of Jesus" in Acts 16:7, stating<sup>3 p 175, 213</sup>, his emphasis, *"Here the modern versions again enjoy the support of the best ancient manuscripts [unspecified]...This passage should interest those KJV Only advocates who cite the variant at Romans 14:10, where modern texts speak of the "judgement seat of God," while the KJV has the "judgement seat of Christ." If reading "God" at Romans 14:10 indicates a theological bias against Christ by modern translations, doesn't **not** reading "Jesus" at Acts 16:7 prove the same thing regarding the KJV? Of course, neither accusation is true.*

*"The phrase "of Jesus" has dropped out of the majority of Greek texts, but is retained in the greater number of ancient witnesses to the book of Acts...if such passages as Romans 14:10 prove some kind of conspiracy on the part of the modern translators, then Acts 16:7 proves an anti-Trinitarian conspiracy on the part of the KJV. Of course, no such conspiracy exists in either case."*

White, like 'our critic,' is a careless student of scripture. Consider the following<sup>8 p 157</sup>.

*"The next "omission" in the AV1611 is in Acts 16:7. Instead of **"the Spirit"**, "the Spirit of Jesus" is found in the NIV, JB, NWT, Ne, G (Griesbach), L, T, Tr, A, W (Bishop Wordsworth, who published an edition of the Greek New Testament. in 1870).*

*"This addition is inappropriate for two reasons:*

- 1. The Bible uses the term **"Spirit of Christ"**, Romans 8:9, 1 Peter 1:11, **"Spirit of his Son"**, Galatians 4:6 and **"Spirit of Jesus Christ"** Philippians 1:19 specifically in the context of the indwelling presence of the Lord in the believer. See also Philippians 1:20. This is **NOT** how "Spirit of Jesus" is used in Acts 16:7 in the NIV etc..*
- 2. The Bible does not use the term "Spirit of Jesus" anywhere. The name **"Jesus"** was bestowed upon Him at his birth by Joseph at the behest of the angel of the Lord and is therefore strongly associated with his humanity, Matthew 1:21. It is surely inappropriate to detach the name **"Jesus"** from his humanity - even though it is*

*SUPER* humanity, Acts 9:3-8 - and give it a spiritual association only. Moreover, Jesus, as a man, 1 Thessalonians 5:23, has a spirit, Luke 2:40, 10:21, 23:46, John 11:33, 13:21. It is wrong to suggest that His spirit has somehow become detached from Him, as the NIV addition implies.

“Our critic fails to mention that “**Christ**” has been omitted from Paul’s salvation message in Acts 16:31 by the NIV, JB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A.

“Is it not “**IMPORTANT DOCTRINE**” for a man **DESIRING TO BE ETERNALLY SAVED** to believe on the Lord Jesus **CHRIST**?”

White mentions the omission of “**Christ**” in Acts 16:31 but again tries to defend the indefensible<sup>3 p 46, 195</sup>. See comments in **Chapter 3**. Returning to Acts 16:7, Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 264ff</sup> has the following comments, his emphases.

“Instead of “**THE SPIRIT**” (AV), in Acts 16:7, we find a unique African reading...Here, some fourth century Charismatic **clown** has created a “spirit of Jesus”: a phenomenal invention if you ever saw one. The expression “**THE SPIRIT**” was written down by the author Acts (Luke) more than **seven times** in the same book (Acts 2:4, 6:10, 8:29, 10:19, 11:12, 28 and 16:7). This time, to get rid of the AV reading, the apostate Nicolaitians (Hort, Nestle, Aland. Metzger...et al.) have to violate their own “**STANDARDS**”...for truth: their “**canons of criticism**” which they themselves professed (get that word!) had invented. This violated canon says: **WE** should choose the reading that best suits **the style** of the author.” Out the window it goes and in comes an expression that is totally **foreign** to the Luke in **BOTH** of his books (the Gospel and the Acts).

“Calling the Holy Spirit “**THE SPIRIT**” is standard in Romans 8:2, 4-5, 23, 26; Ephesians 2:2, 22, 5:9, 18; and Galatians 4:29, 5:15-16, 18, 22, and 25. It is a thoroughly Scriptural expression.

“Calling the Holy Spirit the “spirit of Jesus” is Charismatic Humanistic rubbish. Theologically, it is an attempt to retain **the human spirit of a MAN** (see 2 Cor. 5:16), a Jewish Messiah...**AFTER Pentecost**. This is what Paul said was “**verboden**” in 2 Corinthians 5:16. This would be Jesus “**after the flesh**” (Matt. 1-27), which is the name of a **MAN**; **ask any Hispanic**. The term “**Christ**” is the term for “**anointed**,” and it has to do with the Holy Spirit; so we find, throughout the New Testament, “**the spirit of CHRIST**” (not “**Jesus**”): **NEVER** the “**spirit of Jesus**,” except in two “**extant**,” depraved, Godless corruptions which are no more involved with “**preserving the truth for future generations**” than they are involved with street preaching or jail ministries: the NASV and the NIV.

“Where is this “spirit of Jesus”? He commended **His spirit back to God when He died** (Luke 23:46), and the Holy Spirit Who came at Pentecost was not “**His Spirit**”: it was **HE, Himself** (2 Cor. 3:17; Gal. 2:20), in a spiritual form (Col. 2:9). “The spirit of Jesus” is the most corrupt, radical anachronism ever published in a translation. It was a **human man** who cried “**My God, my God...**” not “**My FATHER, my FATHER...!**” **There never was any rupture in the Godhead...**

“So here in these two perverted, twisted, non-Christian “**Bibles**” (NIV and NASV)), the Holy Spirit of God is referred to (AFTER the resurrection) as **the HUMAN SPIRIT of an ordinary man in the flesh**: “the spirit of Jesus”...James White says “Of course there is no conspiracy in either case” (Rom. 14:10 and Acts 16:7). You mean all five cases, don’t cha, Jimmy: Romans 14:10, Acts 16:7, 4:27, Luke 23:42, and 24:50-51?”



White does not address Acts 4:27 and 30, where modern versions alter “*child*” to “*servant*” or Acts 3:13, 26, where modern versions alter “*Son*” to “*servant*” but it is instructive to note in passing a bible-believing response to the modern corruptions of these four verses. Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 336</sup> states “[The modern versions] use son for paida in John 4:51 in reference to the [nobleman’s] son. This puts Jesus on the same level as the NIV’s “Paul, a servant,” “James, a servant,” “Simon Peter, a servant,” “Jude, a servant,” and “Moses the servant.”” See also this author’s summary<sup>8 p 182ff</sup>.

Dr Ruckman continues.

*“There is “no conspiracy” except an 1,800-year old agreement between spiritual perverts obsessed with their own intellects, who corrupted Scripture right and left, to insert their own private (and absolutely valueless) theologies into the Scriptures. For thirty-five years we have referred to this educational conspiracy as “The Alexandrian Cult,” controlled by the Scholars’ Union...”*

See remarks in **Chapter 4**, with respect to White’s efforts to evade the well deserved rebukes that Dr Ruckman bestows on ‘The Alexandrian Cult.’

White<sup>3 p 213</sup> refers to the NIV, NASV alteration of the AV1611 reading “**judgment seat of Christ**” in Romans 14:10 to “*judgment seat of God*” and naively asks, “*how could [early] believers make such an error in their copying of the Greek manuscripts?*” In answer, it can be said that early corrupters could – and did. See Wilkinson’s remarks under **Early Conspirators and Corrupters**. White nevertheless maintains that changes such as that in Romans 14:10 do not “*materially impact the plain witness to...the New Testament’s teaching on the deity of Christ.*”

“*The plain witness*” of the modern versions is that they most certainly *do*. Romans 14:11, 12, immediately following verse 10, state that, “***For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.***” This clear testimony to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ in Romans 14:10-12 is lost in the NIV, NASV, both of which are in agreement with the JB, NWT in Romans 14:10. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 11, 48</sup> states, his emphasis, of the AV1611 reading “**judgement seat of Christ**” in Romans 14:10 that White maligns, “*The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians quotes [Romans 14:10] as saying...we must all stand at the judgement seat of Christ, and each man must give an account of himself...This reading, which dates to 150 AD, would offer support in favor of the Traditional Text and the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611...*”

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 120</sup> indicates that 12 uncials; ̄ and C second correctors, L, P, Ψ, 048, 049, 056, 0142, 0150, 0151, 0209, possibly P46, the majority of the cursives, 3 Old Latin sources, the Peshitta Syriac and the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible all support the AV1611.

The original texts of ̄ and C, codices A, B, D, Dabs, F, G, 7 Old Latin manuscripts and the Vulgate are among the main witnesses to the reading “*judgement seat of God.*” However, Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 30, 53</sup> also notes that Polycarp (69-156 AD) supports the AV1611 reading, indicating that the reading of the older codices is a later alteration.

Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> have the reading “*judgement seat of God*” and in turn it occurs in Westcott and Hort’s RV and Nestle. However, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, no doubt thanks to the uncorrupted Old Latin, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all support the AV1611 reading “**judgement seat of Christ.**” Their united

testimony with respect to Romans 14:10 is an outstanding witness to the preservation of the true text of scripture from earliest times, i.e. Polycarp.

White says of Acts 22:16, where the AV1611 reading **“the name of the Lord”** is opposed by the modern reading **“his name”** that **““the name of the Lord” is the reading of the majority of Greek manuscripts... Other older Greek texts, such as Von Soden and Tregelles, note the variant. Von Soden points out that it is probably another example of parallel influence from Romans 10:13 and 1 Corinthians 1:2.”**

See comments above. Again, White gives no evidence to substantiate von Soden’s opinion, so it can be summarily dismissed. Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 117</sup> notes that some cursives, the one extant Old Latin source and the Peshitta Syriac follow  $\kappa$ , A, B, E, which have the modern reading but states that **“The context, with Acts 9:5, 6 shows that the “Lord” is Christ.”** The main witnesses in support of the AV1611 are the majority of cursives,  $\Psi$ , 049, 056, 0142.

Acts 22:16 is also a fulfilment of Acts 2:21, which is a quotation from Joel 2:32.

**“And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.”**

Note further that, following Pentecost, Acts 2, baptism in the Book of Acts is said to be **“in the name of the Lord Jesus”** Acts 8:16, 19:5 and **“in the name of the Lord”** Acts 10:48. The phrase **“in the name of the Lord”** therefore fits with Ananias’s exhortation to Paul in Acts 22:16, **“arise, and be baptized”** and is consistent with Luke’s use of the phrase throughout the Book of Acts.

It is therefore correct as it stands in the majority of manuscripts and in the AV1611.

White’s next verse is Romans 1:16, where he<sup>3 p 176, 190</sup> seeks to defend the omission of **“of Christ”** by the NASV, NIV because they **“are following the most ancient manuscripts... P 26,  $\kappa$ , A, B, C, D\* [original reading], G and others.”** See comments above.

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit **“of Christ”** and in turn influence Westcott and Hort to omit the phrase from their RV and Nestle to do likewise.

Dr Moorman shows that D with a correction, K, L, P,  $\Psi$  have the AV1611 reading along with the majority of the manuscripts but the 3 extant Old Latin sources, the Vulgate and Peshitta Syriac omit **“of Christ,”** which would explain why Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> also omits **“of Christ”** in Romans 1:16.

Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops<sup>138</sup> nevertheless agree with the AV1611.

While the bulk of witnesses and the English bibles from Greek sources support the AV1611, confirmation that the AV1611 reading is correct stems from the verse itself, especially insofar as Paul warned in his letters of **“another gospel”** 2 Corinthians 11:4, Galatians 1:16. Of which gospel is Paul not ashamed? It is **“the gospel of Christ”** that Paul also calls **“the gospel of his Son”** in Romans 1:9. Omission of **“of Christ”** in verse 16 clearly gives rise to a contradiction in terms unworthy of the apostle Paul and the resulting modern reading, which White favours, is therefore in error.

White is most pleased to note in Romans 8:34 that the NASV has **“Christ Jesus is He who died”** whereas the AV1611 only has **“It is Christ that died”** and states that **“ $\kappa$ , A, and C (and possibly P46) have the name “Jesus” at Romans 8:34, while the [majority] text and B do not have it... Its importance to the KJV Only issue should be readily apparent: is the NASB “superior” to the KJV at Romans 8:34... Is the KJV trying to “hide” the**

*name of Jesus here? Of course not, and yet this is again, a further example of the inconsistency in the application of arguments on the part of the KJV Only advocates.”*

The “inconsistency” with respect to bible believers exists only in White’s imagination.

Tischendorf<sup>62</sup>, with partial support from Lachmann, influence Westcott and Hort to add “Jesus” in Romans 8:34 in the RV and Nestle to do likewise. Here, White has shown that Westcott and Hort have actually abandoned Codex B in order to depart from the AV1611. See this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 293</sup> for a similar example, where Dr Ruckman shows that Nestle omitted Luke 24:12, on the sole basis of Codex D, even though P75 and Codices ̈ and B had the reading.

Wycliffe also adds “Jesus” in Romans 8:34 but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops<sup>138</sup> agree with the AV1611, emphasising what must have been recognised as the true text from Greek sources.

As in the case of Acts 22:16, any apparent difficulty is resolved by inspection of the scripture. Romans 8:34 refers to **“Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.”** See also Revelation 1:18, **“I am he that liveth, and was dead.”** The Lord is here referring to His death on the cross, John 19:33-35, Philippians 2:8, **“his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem”** Luke 9:31.

But the scripture reveals *another* ‘Christ,’ who will also accomplish a death *and* a resurrection but he is *not* **“at the right hand of God”** and he does *not* **“maketh intercession for the saints.”**

Because this ‘Christ’ is not Christ Jesus, i.e. not **“the Lord’s Christ”** Luke 2:26 or **“that Christ, the Son of the living God”** John 6:69 but the most prominent of the **“false Christs”** Matthew 24:24, of whom the Lord warned, **“many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ...go ye not therefore after them”** Luke 21:8. As John reveals, **“Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son”** 1 John 2:22, because he declares that *he* is **“the Lord’s Christ,”** according to a Satanic strategy purloined from Exodus 4:15. Just as Moses was to Aaron **“instead of God”** so the Devil’s ‘Christ’ will be ‘instead of’ the Lord Jesus Christ, because Satan is **“the prince of this world”** John 12:31, 14:30 and **“the god of this world”** 2 Corinthians 4:4 and **“the great dragon”** Revelation 12:9 and as John reveals further with respect to antichrist or the ‘instead of’ Christ, **“the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority”** Revelation 13:2.

That is why the ‘instead of’ Christ **“opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven”** Revelation 13:6, by declaring that *he* is the true Christ, when he is actually a Satanic impostor *but he will convince multitudes of unbelievers of his false identity during the Tribulation period.*

Because the ‘instead of’ Christ accomplishes a death and a resurrection in Revelation 13:3.

**“And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.”** Thanks in no small part to his acolytes, as the Lord also warned, **“And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many”** Matthew 24:11, i.e. not a few but **“many.”**

Note Dr Ruckman’s remarks<sup>123 p 38, 56-7</sup> in the previous chapter with respect to Isaiah 14:12 and this additional comment, his emphasis.

*“The Devil’s Christ...bears the titles, “the Man of Sin,” “the Son of Perdition,” “the Beast,” and “the Anti-Christ”...Hence, the Holy Spirit distinguishes between the LORD’S CHRIST (Luke 2:26, Acts 4:26) and the ANTI-CHRIST (1 John 2:18, 4:3). The word anti in Greek is not only used for “against” or “opposing something,” but is also used in the sense of “something over against something just like it” (Rev. 6:2). This identifies the “christ” of Satan. He is a perfect imitation of the real thing.”*

Even to the extent of staging a death and resurrection. But he is *not* Christ Jesus and the AV1611 reading in Romans 8:34 – together with related scriptures, see above – enables this distinction to be drawn immediately. The modern alternative obscures the distinction.

White now objects to the statement **“But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work”** found in Romans 11:6 of the AV1611 by means of the unproven assertion that *“Some early scribe either felt that the statement needed to be expanded, or...[that] this passage contained the longer ending.”*

The statement is omitted in the NASV, NIV. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles omit the statement<sup>62</sup> and Alford regards it as doubtful. This is sufficient to convince Nestle to omit it as well and Westcott and Hort to delete it from the RV.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 119</sup> shows that the second correction of  $\aleph$  supports the AV1611, also B with variation, plus L,  $\Psi$ , 049, 056, 0142, 0151, along with the majority of the cursives.

But the 2<sup>nd</sup> century Peshitta Syriac bears early witness to the AV1611 reading, which therefore must have existed at the same time as or even before P46, which is the earliest witness in favour of the omission and in agreement with the original text of  $\aleph$  and A, C, D among the older uncials. Later (9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> century) uncials Dabs, F, G, P agree with the omission as do a few cursives, two of which White<sup>3 p 190</sup> lists, together with the 8 extant Old Latin copies and the Vulgate, which explains why Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> does not have the statement, although Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> support the AV1611.

The English Bible tradition, reflecting the Traditional Text from Greek sources and the early attestation of the Peshitta Syriac, implying on this occasion that the extant Old Latin was corrupted in this verse, bear witness against White’s notion that the statement is a later addition, especially insofar as he cannot produce a source in favour of the omission that predates the text of the Peshitta.

Nevertheless, White is of the opinion that *“the addition is not wholly in line with Paul’s thinking, for while the term “grace” carries with it the freedom and “unmeritedness” that marks its use in Paul’s theology, the term “work” does not convey the same kinds of ideas.”*

Which is surely why Paul states in the first part of Romans 11:6, **“And if by grace, then is it no more of works.”** Dr Moorman explains both why it is White’s thinking that *“is not wholly in line with Paul’s thinking”* and why the statement **“But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work”** as found in the AV1611 is scripture.

*“This is the Bible’s strongest statement showing that in the saving of the soul grace and works cannot be mingled.”*

Dr Moorman’s observation is definitely *“wholly in line with Paul’s thinking.”*

White says of the phrase **“of the gospel”** in Romans 15:29 – see introductory comments above – that *“The phrase is not found in a wide variety of manuscripts, primarily of the*

*Alexandrian type* [surprise, surprise].” He states<sup>3 p 190</sup> “*The phrase is not found in P46 ⋈\* A B C D F G P 6 81 629 620 1506 1739 1881 and a few others.*”

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 120</sup> reveals that the phrase *is* found in 8 uncials; ⋈ second corrector, L, Ψ, 049, 056, 0142, 0150, 0151, and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century Peshitta Syriac, along with the majority of the cursive manuscripts. Besides the phrase’s omission from P46 and 9 uncials; ⋈ original, A, B, C, D, Dabs, F, G, P and a few cursives (White lists 7+), it is missing from the 8 extant Old Latin copies and Jerome’s Vulgate, which would explain why Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits it.

However, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all have “*of the gospel*” in Romans 15:29.

The existence of the phrase in 2<sup>nd</sup> century Peshitta Syriac and its transmission through the line of English bibles faithful to the Traditional Text, up to and including the AV1611, bear witness to the phrase as genuine scripture, preserved intact from the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD, regardless of White’s attempt at obfuscation of this textual fact.

White aims to excise the phrase “*for the earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof*” from 1 Corinthians 10:28, because, his emphasis, “*it does illustrate yet again the tendency toward **expansion** that is found in the New Testament manuscripts...a later scribe [was led] to repeat the phrase yet once again in verse 28, though in all honesty the phrase simply does not fit at this point, while it made sense in verse 26.*”

White<sup>3 p 190</sup> states further that, “*The reading is found only in the third-hand correction of C, the final corrector of H, and in the original of the eighth- or ninth-century manuscript Ψ. From here, however, it became the [Majority] reading.*”

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 81</sup> has summarised the support for the AV1611 reading. See below, with updated reference.

“*Ruckman*<sup>141 p 32</sup>, indicates that the AV1611 reading is found in the vast majority of manuscripts, in all four families and in citations from Origen (200 AD).”

The reading cannot be a later “*expansion*,” if it existed in 200 AD.

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit the reading and therefore it has been deleted from Westcott and Hort’s RV and from Nestle.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> does not have the reading but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all contain the reading, thus demonstrating the preservation of its lineage from apostolic times as a genuine portion of scripture— see Dr Ruckman’s evidence above.

The Latin Vulgate<sup>142</sup> lacks the reading in verse 28, expressed in verse 26 as “*Domini est terra et plenitudo eius.*” It may therefore also be lacking from the (corrupted) extant copies of the Old Latin, which in turn would have influenced Wycliffe and likewise with respect to all other departures in Wycliffe’s Bible from the lineage of the Traditional Text as evidenced by Tyndale, the Geneva, the Bishops’ and the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible.

White’s notion that “*the phrase simply does not fit*” in 1 Corinthians 10:28 suggests that not only is he a superficial student of the scriptures but also that he has never had to forgo a meal. The sense of the statement “*for the earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof*” in verse 28 is simply that God can provide sustenance from another source<sup>143 p 214</sup>, if necessary. It is therefore entirely appropriate in the context.

“*For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills*” Psalm 50:10.

White's<sup>3</sup> p 179-180 next target is Ephesians 3:9, with respect to the readings "*fellowship*," "*world*" and "*by Jesus Christ*," as found in the AV1611, which he regards as spurious, based on the opinion of Bruce Metzger. The modern versions, NASV, NIV and the modern editors, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup>, Westcott and Hort in the RV and Nestle omit "*by Jesus Christ*." They follow<sup>9</sup> 129 P46, Ɀ, A, B, C, the original text of D, F, G, P, Ψ, some cursives that White lists from Metzger.

Most of the Old Latin, the Peshitta Syriac and the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible also omit the phrase. (No Old Latin copies appear to retain it.)

10 uncials; D first corrector, Dabs, K, L, 049, 056, 078, 0142, 0150, 0151 and the majority of the cursives contain the phrase.

Its absence from the Old Latin would explain why it is missing from Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> but it is found in Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishop's<sup>138</sup>. Again, these older English versions bear faithful witness to the lineage of Traditional Text that reaches its final form in the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible, the apparent deficiencies on this occasion in the Old Latin, Peshitta Syriac and Gothic Bibles notwithstanding.

God used the older English versions, starting with Tyndale, to bring in the English Reformation, thus vindicating their texts. He did not do so with the earlier versions in other languages or with the majority of Greek manuscripts, an indication that although they were mostly faithful witnesses to the true text of scripture, they were in need of refining and had been subjected to corruption.

See Dr Moorman's<sup>11</sup> p 27-8 remarks in *White's Introduction* and Dr Ruckman's<sup>33</sup> p 98-9 and Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>39</sup> p 952ff, 963 remarks in *Chapter 4*.

*"In the previous pages we have shown that the defence of the King James Bible has been the very last thing on the mind of Textual Criticism. Almost all energy has been directed toward "reconstructing" the text on the basis of a few old uncials, and ferreting out what little support can be gathered for these MSS. The evidence I have gathered is probably as extensive as any now available. Yet in comparison to what could be gathered by a first-hand search of all the MSS, it is only a few scraps from the tables of men who treat the Authorised Version with scholarly contempt!*

*"Our extant MSS reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89, Jude 3). After the advent of printing (AD 1450), the necessity of God preserving the MS witness to the text was diminished. Therefore, in some instances the majority of MSS extant today may not reflect at every point what the true, commonly accepted, and majority reading was 500 years ago..."*

Dr Ruckman:

*"There are two types of Old Latin readings: European and African. The old European (Note: "Italy" – Itala) was the type Jerome (from ITALY) used to bring the Old Latin into line with the Pope (who was in ITALY). Any "Old Itala" would have been the right "Old Latin" BEFORE JEROME MESSED WITH IT, and consequently, any Old Latin would have been the right text in Africa before ORIGEN messed with it. Thus Jerome, Origen, and Augustine stand perpetually bound together as an eternal memorial to the depravity of Bible rejecting "Fundamentalists," who enthrone their egos as the Holy Spirit."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger:

*"Jerome corrupted [the] pure Old Itala Bible in the fourth century. He admitted [this] in his Preface..."*

*“It must be remembered that even the 5200 existing handwritten Greek manuscripts were the product of the **Greek Orthodox Church**. Its membership has never been made up of true believers. The scriptures have been entrusted to the priesthood of true believers, just as they were entrusted to the Hebrew priests in the Old Testament. Unbelievers, Greek speaking or otherwise, cannot discern spiritual things...*

*“The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to ‘the Greek’ and downplaying the common man’s Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today’s pseudo-intellectuals call ‘the critical text,’ ‘the original Greek,’ ‘the Majority Text,’ or the ‘Textus Receptus.’ There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no ‘Dead Bible Society’ to translate it into “everyday English,” using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors.”*

See **Chapter 4** for more detailed comment on Ephesians 3:9 and **Chapter 6** for comments on the terms “age” versus “**world**.”

White next tries to prove that Philippians 1:14 is one of “a very few” readings in “the Byzantine text-type...that are both ancient and unique.” See comments from Pickering and others summarised earlier in this chapter that expose White’s falsehood in this respect.

White now attempts to show that Codex Sinaiticus, Ⲙ, was “highly esteemed” because “the second corrector of Sinaiticus, who work is dated to the seventh century” inserted the phrase “**of the sins**” in Colossians 2:11, as found in the AV1611 but not in the NIV, NASV. White says that the insertion proves that “the manuscript was...used so often and for so long as to collect so many corrections.” However, he does not say who “highly esteemed” this corrupt document – see Burgon’s evaluation of Codex Ⲙ – so he has no proof that genuine bible believers esteemed it and if it had only been carefully examined twice in 300 years since its compilation in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, by its first and second correctors, it cannot have been used very often.

Moreover, his notion that a “highly esteemed” manuscript needed repeated corrections – and in the direction of the supposedly inferior “Byzantine text-type” is a blatant contradiction in terms.

White says further that, in addition to the original form of Colossians 2:11 in Codex Ⲙ, “The phrase is not found in P46 B C and others.”

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit “**of the sins**” and it is therefore not found in Westcott and Hort’s RV or in Nestle. The words are missing from Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> have them, with slight variation, Tyndale and the Geneva having “the sinful body of the flesh.”

Unlike Codex Ⲙ, P46, B, C, these are the sources, together with the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible, that God has “highly esteemed.”

White points to the difference between Colossians 2:18 in the AV1611, “**he hath not seen**” and in the NIV, NASV, “he has seen” and uses it as another opportunity to attack Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 106</sup>. He states, his emphases, “Some [i.e. Dr Mrs Riplinger] have referred to this passage as evidence that modern scholars wish to lead believers to disobey God’s Word by having “visions.” In reality, the support for the NIV’s rendering encom-

*passes manuscripts from both the Alexandrian and Western families. What is more, it is hard to understand how anyone could present such an argument. Nothing in the passage in either translation asserts the reality of such “visions.” The NIV translation is easily understood in the context of such a person **claiming** to have seen things, but it does not assert that they actually **have** seen such things...The point of the passage has to do with what men with “unspiritual minds” do, not that they actually **have** such visions, or that these visions correspond to reality.”*

Given that the readings are nevertheless mutually exclusive, White seeks to justify the NIV, NASV reading with the help of Metzger<sup>3 p 266</sup>, who insists that the modern reading “*is strongly supported by P46 and good representatives of the Alexandrian and Western types of text (the original text of  $\aleph$ , A, B, the original text of D, I 33 1730...Speculum...).* Apparently the negative (...F, G, the second correctors of  $\aleph$  and D<sup>9 p 132</sup>, C K P  $\Psi$  Old Latin Peshitta Syriac Gothic...) was added by copyists who either misunderstood the sense of *εμβάτευων* [“intruding into”] or wished to enhance the polemical nuance that is carried on by the following *εἰκη φουσιουμενο*  $\varsigma$  [“in vain being puffed up”].”

The above is merely Metzger’s opinion (and White’s). Neither can advance any proof to show that what they each speculate actually took place. As Dr Moorman shows<sup>9 p 132</sup>, 15 uncials;  $\aleph$  second corrector, C, D second corrector, F, G, K, L, P,  $\Psi$ , 049, 056, 075, 0142, 0150, 0151, 9 of the 12 extant Old Latin sources, and the Peshitta Syriac, the texts of which predate P46<sup>9 p 33, 12, p 208</sup>, some of the Vulgate and the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible all support the AV1611 reading. The Old Latin and Peshitta texts indicate that the AV1611 reading “**he hath not seen**” is the true reading and that the word “**not**” was omitted by a few corrupt sources and is not a later insertion.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 645</sup> confirms that the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible has the AV1611 reading “**he hath not seen.**” Moorman confirm the witnesses against the AV1611 that White lists.

Metzger’s subtle wording to the effect that  $\aleph$ , A, B, D are “*good representatives of the Alexandrian and Western types of text*” does not alter the fact that they are *poor* representatives of the *true* text.

Apparently neither White nor Metzger understood that it would impossible for such a wide range of copyists *all* to make the supposed identical error that Metzger describes.

Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>62</sup> omit “**not**” from their texts and Lachmann regards it as doubtful. These editors influenced Westcott and Hort to omit the word from the RV and Nestle to do likewise.

However, on this occasion, all the faithful English precursors of the AV1611; Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup>, read with the AV1611’s “**he hath not seen.**” Against this combined witness are the conjectures of Metzger, White and a few corrupt Egyptian sources.

Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 138-9, 140, 355-6</sup> has these comments, his emphases.

*“We proceed to remark on each of the five principal Classes of alterations indicated by the Revisionists: and first, - ‘Alterations positively required by change of reading of the Greek Text’... ‘**Dwelling in the things which he hath seen:**’ for which the margin offers as an alternative, ‘**taking his stand upon.**’ (Colossians ii. 18). But *εμβάτευων* (the word here employed) clearly means neither the one nor the other. S. Paul is delivering a warning against unduly ‘**pryng into the things not seen.**’ A few MSS. of bad character omit the ‘not.’ That is all!...*



*“This [omission of the ‘not’] happens not infrequently in codices of the type of  $\kappa$  and B. A famous instance occurs at Col. ii. 18, ( $\alpha\mu\eta\ \epsilon\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu$ ), - ‘prying into the things he hath not seen’; where the original text of  $\kappa$ , A, B, the original text of D and a little handful of suspicious documents leave out the ‘not.’ Our Editors, rather than recognise this blunder (so obvious and ordinary!), are for conjecturing  $\alpha\ \epsilon\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu$  into  $\alpha\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \kappa\epsilon\nu\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu$ ; which (if it means anything at all) may as well mean, - ‘proceeding on an airy foundation to offer an empty conjecture.’ Dismissing that conjecture as worthless, we have to set off the whole mass of the copies – against some 6 or 7:- Irenaeus, Theodorus Mops., Chrysostomus, Theodoret, John Damascene – against no Fathers at all...Jerome and Augustine both take notice of the diversity of reading, **but only to reject it.** The Syriac version, the Vulgate, Gothic, Georgian, Slavonic, Ethiopic, Arabic and Armenian - ...are to be set against the dubious Coptic. All these then are with the Traditional Text: which cannot seriously be suspected of error.”*

Unlike Messrs White and Metzger.

In his haste to attack Dr Mrs Riplinger yet again, White bypassed the salient points that she made about the poor translation of Colossians 2:18 in the modern versions.

*“The NASB...adds the word ‘visions’ which is not in any Greek manuscripts. Further, “taking his stand” [NASV] is not an accurate translation of embateuo, which all inter-linear bibles render as the KJV does.”*

She also makes mention of *“books like Angels on Assignment, by Assembly of God Pastor Buck, are urging readers to pursue visions and return to Rome.”* White failed to mention this particular example, which in part vindicates Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning.

White’s opinion that *“The point of the passage has to do with what men with “unspiritual minds” do, not that they actually **have** such visions, or that these visions correspond to reality”* overlooks the fact that Colossians 2:18 in either the NASV or the NIV is open to a different interpretation.

*“A vision of angels”* Luke 24:23, Acts 10:3, 27:23 is possible after the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. The individual in Colossians 2:18 is said to have a *“fleshly mind”* NASV or an *“unspiritual mind”* NIV, so that the vision he has received serves only to inflate his ego. He should instead humbly receive whatever insight the vision imparts – as Cornelius did. This interpretation, which is just as feasible as White’s, lends further support to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning.

However, the AV1611 reading unequivocally precludes any such spurious interpretation.

White<sup>3 p 182</sup> maintains that the word *“wise”* in the AV1611 reading *“the only wise God”* in 1 Timothy 1:17 was either inserted from Romans 16:27, although the reading here is *“God only wise,”* or *“dropped out by accident again owing to scribal error.”* He therefore confesses that he doesn’t know what the word of God is at this point and tries to evade the issue with the statement that *“there is no attempt to strip God of His wisdom in the modern versions, which include the term at Romans 16:27.”*

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> all omit *“wise”* from 1 Timothy 1:17 and therefore so do Westcott and Hort’s RV and Nestle.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 134</sup> indicates that the majority of the cursives and 13 uncials;  $\kappa$  second corrector, D first corrector, a third or subsequent corrector of the 6<sup>th</sup> century uncial H, K, L, P,  $\Psi$ , 056, 075, 0142, 0150, 0151, 0262 and the pre-350 AD Gothic all read *“wise”* with the AV1611 in 1 Timothy 1:17. The 4<sup>th</sup> century writers Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzen also agree with the AV1611<sup>130 p 57</sup>. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits *“wise”* but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the

Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops'<sup>138</sup> all contain “*wise*” in 1 Timothy 1:17. Together, these sources, which include most of the lineage of the pre-AV1611 English Bibles, thereby bear witness to the preservation of the AV1611 reading from earliest times.

The original readings of 8, D, H, together with A, F, G, a few, or no, cursives and the 3 extant copies of the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac omit “*wise*” as do the 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> century writer Tertullian and the 3<sup>rd</sup> century writer Novatian. These two writers and the versions, of which the Old Latin most likely influenced Wycliffe, pre-date most of the sources that agree with the AV1611. However, since no evidence is forthcoming (from White) on how an insertion from Romans 16:27 could have taken place and the bulk of the available witnesses, including the early Gothic Bible, favours the AV1611 reading, it is clear that the sources which omit “*wise*” are deficient in 1 Timothy 1:17.

Moreover, White fails to inform his readers that the NASV, NIV also omit “*wise*” from “*the only wise God*” in Jude 25, the only other verse in the New Testament where this phrase occurs. If, according to James White, “*there is no attempt to strip God of His wisdom in the modern versions,*” why do the NASV, NIV omit two of the three readings in the New Testament that refer most strongly to God’s wisdom and where both of these omissions subvert the explicit expression “*the only wise God*”?

White fails to address these questions. His failure in this respect further discredits the modern versions with respect to 1 Timothy 1:17.

White sounds a note of triumph<sup>3 p 182-3, 190-1</sup> with respect to James 5:16, where the AV1611 has “*faults*” and the NASV, NIV have “*sins.*” He has found a citation error in the books of Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 145</sup>, Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 101</sup> and Dr Sam Gipp<sup>59 p 363</sup> – and is therefore able to exploit another opportunity to attack his favourite target, Sister Riplinger.

White declares that, “*The support for “sins” comes from the ancient uncial texts, the reading “faults” arising later and becoming the majority reading.*”

As usual, the evidence for the “*the reading “faults” arising later*” is not forthcoming. White merely assumes that this is the case because the oldest uncial manuscripts have “*sins.*” See again **Chapter 3** for Burgon’s exhaustive evaluation of the untrustworthiness of these sources.

White then cites Dr Ruckman as follows, Dr Ruckman’s emphases:

““*You say what is the manuscript evidence?*” *The evidence is not listed. In the footnotes (on p. 582 of Nestle’s) you will find Aleph, B, and A listed every time they appear anywhere in James 5:11-20, but they are not listed for James 5:16! “τος αμαρτιας” [“your sins”] is a Roman Catholic interpolation, adopted by the ASV (1901) and the RSV (1952) to help the Ecumenical movement along, and the ASV is just as corrupt as its cousin, in this reading.*”

White speculates that Dr Ruckman’s statement above “*may well explain where Gail Riplinger derived her information on the same passage*” and he then cites Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement, ““*KJV...confess your faults (All Greek texts have the word for faults here, not sins).*””

In his notes he states that “*The reading “sins” is found in 8 A B K P 048 33 81 614 630 1241 1505 1739 and others...Samuel Gipp...makes the exact same mistake in his book, An Understandable History of the Bible...“The Greek word for “faults” (paraptomata) is found in MSS E, F, G, H, S, V, Y, and Omega, plus the rest of the Receptus family and [Dr Gipp’s emphases] and the greater number of all remaining witnesses. Nestle’s text inserts “sins” (tax amartias) [sic] inserted by White] with NO manuscript authority, and*

*the misguided men of the Lockman Foundation **accept it with no evidence**. Perhaps there are more Jesuits lurking in the shadows than we think! Anyone accepting an alternate reading with **no evidence** CANNOT be credited with acting ethically or scholarly [[sic] inserted by White].” Dr Gipp is not only completely in error in his assertion that there is no manuscript evidence, but he should apply his standards to the TR, which contains a number of readings that have “no evidence” to support them.”*

See **Chapter 4** for consideration of White’s conjectures about the TR.

He says of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s and Dr Ruckman’s statements his emphasis, “Neither Ruckman nor Riplinger is correct. Ruckman...is simply misreading [Nestle’s] apparatus.  $\aleph$ , A and B are **not** cited in every variant, especially when they read as the text stands. At James 5:16 they read exactly as the text does, hence only the variant and its supporting manuscripts are cited. There is simply no basis for Riplinger’s grand conspiratorial scheme. Seemingly Riplinger, following Ruckman’s reading of the Nestle text, falls into the same trap, as her chart appears in a section where she is also asserting that modern versions are polluted by Roman influence. She is simply incorrect in her assertion regarding the Greek texts.”

White’s criticisms of his opponents, especially Dr Mrs Riplinger, are unjustified.

It is not clear (to this author) why  $\aleph$ , A and B are not cited in James 5:16, if they are cited everywhere else in Nestle’s apparatus for James 5:11-20. White gives no examples of where these sources do not “read exactly as the text does” elsewhere in the passage. If they do “read exactly as the text does” in other parts of the passage, why are they nevertheless cited when there is no necessity for so doing, according to White?

White refers to a “trap” with respect to Nestle’s text. Why would any New Testament Greek editor even want to set a “trap”? White does not say.

He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of “asserting that modern versions are polluted by Roman influence” yet he fails to address any of the evidence that she produces to this effect in Chapter 8 of her book. On the same page that she refers to James 5:16, she also reproduces a quote from an issue of *The Christian Herald* to the effect that “Jim Bakker...said he had spent the last year...confessing to a Catholic priest.” Why would Bakker do this, unless he had the support of the modern versions in James 5:16 for his ‘confession’?

Also on that page, Dr Mrs Riplinger illustrates the drift of the modern versions, NASV, NIV to papist language with:

Matthew 23:5, “they...lengthen the tassels of their garments” NASV, “make...the tassels on their garments long” NIV in versus “**enlarge the borders of their garments**” AV1611. The implication is that, thanks to the modern versions, it is scriptural to wear the vestments of a Baalite priest, 2 Kings 10:22 or a monk’s habit, provided the tassels that fasten them are not made long.

Luke 1:23, “his priestly service” NASV, versus “**his ministration**” AV1611. Even Nestle does not have “priestly” but simply “[his] service.”

Romans 15:16, “ministering as a priest the gospel of God” NASV, “the priestly duty of proclaiming the gospel of God” NIV, versus “**ministering the gospel of God**” AV1611. See remarks on this verse in **Chapter 6** and note especially Dr Ruckman’s comments<sup>1 p 144</sup>, in view of White’s criticisms of Dr Gipp about applications of ‘standards’ – see above.

*“Neither word [“priest,” “priestly”] is found in one Greek variant “extant” in any family or text type of Greek manuscript...To cite White’s comment<sup>3 p 66, 87</sup> on Erasmus’ ending on Revelation, chapter 22...“There is no Greek manuscript extant for “priest” or “priestly.”” I wonder what Paul would have thought if you had read his “original” back to him as it showed up in the NIV and NASV?...”*

White has no comment on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s evidence, apart from his obfuscation on Romans 15:16, addressed in **Chapter 6**. But this evidence shows unequivocally that the modern versions ARE “polluted by Roman influence,” in spite of White’s attempt to imply otherwise.

The alteration of “*paraptomata*” for “*faults*” into “*hamartias*” for “*sins*” is found in the editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles<sup>62</sup> and therefore in Nestle and Westcott and Hort’s RV. The reading “*sins*” is also found<sup>8 p 87</sup> in the DR, JR, JB and NWT. See **Appendix, Table A1**. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> reads “*sins*” but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all read “*faults*” with the AV1611.

In sum, the English Protestant Bibles; Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops’, AV1611 read “*faults*” in James 5:16 and the Catholic bibles; DR, RV, JB, NWT read “*sins*.”

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 141</sup> cites K, L, 049, 056, 0142 and the majority of the cursives as reading “*faults*” in James 5:16 and κ, A, B, P, Ψ, 048 and some cursives as reading “*sins*.” He states that, “*The versional evidence does not distinguish between the two readings*” and adds, significantly, “*There is but a short step from this alteration to the “Confessional.”*”

Dr Ruckman<sup>144 p 145-6</sup> echoes this conclusion, his emphases.

*“The word for “faults” in [James 5:16] was altered to “sins” by all Catholic Bibles to justify the non-scriptural “confessional.” All the modern, up-to-date, corrupt, demonic, “clearer” translations follow Rome...*

*““Faults” (παράπτωματα) are not classified exactly as “sins” (αμαρτιας). It is the grossly corrupt Vatican manuscript for the Jesuit Rheims Bible of 1582 that alters “faults” (παράπτωματα) to “sins” (αμαρτιας): a simple case of Satanic LYING (John 8:40-48).”*

Noting again White’s criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger with respect to James 5:16 and since he has read<sup>3 p 189, 275</sup> her book *Which Bible Is God’s Word?*, he should at least have had the grace to acknowledge her revised comments<sup>8 p 87, 96 p 102, 1st Edition</sup> on this verse, her emphasis.

*“Manuscripts Aleph, B, A, P, as well as Scrivener’s a, c, d and Tregelles 13, do say “sins.” There is also a citation by Ephraem the Syrian that says “sins.” However, uncials K, L, 049, cursives 322, 323, 1846, 2298, and the majority of Greek manuscripts say the word “faults.” Even textual critics like Griesbach and Alford retain the word “faults” in their text [the word “sins” having been substituted by Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles – see above].*

*“I would direct any reader who is looking at manuscript evidence and trying to determine what manuscripts to trust, to read Codex B and Its Allies by Herman Hoskier. Hoskier did an extensive collation of these corrupt uncial manuscripts that read “sins” in that reading (Aleph and B et al.). He proved, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the manuscripts underlying the new versions, like the NIV and NASB, are totally corrupt. When you compare Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph) with each other [White’s<sup>3 p 33</sup> ‘great codices’], in the gospels alone, they disagree with each other three thousand times. So, if almost all of the manuscripts in the world say “faults” and a handful of corrupt manu-*

*scripts that do not even agree with each other, say “sins,” it is evident that the body of Christ throughout history has rejected these old uncials. Because these manuscripts were not copied, we have the verdict of history against them,”*

White<sup>3 p 123</sup> also quotes (disparagingly, of course) from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s book<sup>7</sup> *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides*, indicating that he has read it.

Therefore why doesn’t White at least have the grace to acknowledge Dr Mrs Riplinger’s revised comments<sup>7 Part 6</sup> about James 5:16?

*“James 5:16: White claims, “she is also asserting that modern versions are polluted by Roman [Catholic] influence. She is simply incorrect.” Is White aware of the fact that Time magazine (Dec. 26, 1994-Jan. 2, 1995, pp. 72-73) notes that “the best-known candidate [for the next Pope] is Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini...a Jesuit...on order with a reputation for liberalism.” Martini was one of the five men who created the UBS Greek text underlying new versions. When is a Catholic Cardinal using the Vatican’s own Vaticanus (B) MS not a Catholic? The Greek textual evidence is overwhelmingly on the side of the rendering ‘faults’ not ‘sins’.”*

Martini did not become Pope but he remains a Catholic corrupting influence. Dr Mrs Riplinger continues with respect to White’s notion that Codex 8 was “highly esteemed” because “the manuscript was...used so often and for so long as to collect so many corrections.” See comments above. White, however, has no explanation for why this document and the other old codices were not copied – as their locations demonstrated when they were discovered. See **Chapter 3**. Dr Mrs Riplinger states, her emphases.

*“The manuscript evidence given in New Age Bible Versions was not slavishly culled from someone else’s review of the facts (UBS 4<sup>th</sup>, Nestle’s 27<sup>th</sup>, or Hodges et al.). It is important to read thoroughly the history of **each** reading and come to a decision which is not second-hand. The reading ‘sins’ has been shown to be a very isolated error (or heretical depravation). The many correctors of Aleph and B (11 total and over 15,000 corrections in Aleph alone) make it imperative that the originator and date of the reading be established **before** one assumes an Aleph & B reading is authentic, not one ‘corrected’ before it left the scriptorium, or in the 12<sup>th</sup> century.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger appears to have concluded that the “Aleph & B reading” is “one ‘corrected’ before it left the scriptorium” i.e. corrupted. If so, it appears that she is correct – as well as providing clarification of her earlier statement in *New Age Versions*<sup>14 p 144</sup> i.e. “(All [uncorrupted] Greek texts have the word for faults here, not sins).”

White tries to defend another Catholic reading in 1 Peter 2:2, where the modern versions have the ending “grow in respect to salvation” NASV, “grow up in your salvation” NIV instead of the AV1611’s “**grow thereby**” with respect to “**the sincere milk of the word.**”

White denies that 1 Peter 2:2 in the modern versions teaches “a “works-salvation” system.” He says that “The phrase “unto salvation” is found in a large proportion of the more ancient manuscripts, and represents a rather clear Alexandrian + Western reading against the Byzantine family reading.”

White lists<sup>3 p 191</sup> the Alexandrian + Western sources as “P72 8 A B C K P Ψ 33 69 81 323 614 630 945 1241 1505 1739 and others.”

He continues, his emphasis, “The alleged theological problem is not a problem at all. Just as we are to “work out” our salvation with fear and trembling (Philippians 2:12...), so we are to “grow up in respect to salvation,” that is, we are to increase in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we are to grow up in the faith, becoming mature be-

lievers. *The possible misuse of a passage cannot be made the basis upon which we determine textual readings.*"

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> add "*unto salvation*" so that their texts and those of Nestle and Westcott and Hort's RV read "*ye may grow thereby unto salvation*" RV, or similar. This is also the reading of the Catholic bibles, DR, JR, JB, NWT. See *Appendix, Table A1*. In contrast, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup> and the Geneva<sup>49</sup> do not add "*unto salvation*" to 1 Peter 2:2, although the Bishops<sup>138</sup> adds the words in brackets.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 142</sup> states that in addition to P72, Ɀ, A, B C, K, Ψ and some of the cursives, both the extant Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac add "*unto salvation*" to 1 Peter 2:2, although the majority of the cursives do not. He therefore concludes that the addition of the words "*unto salvation*" constitute "*a classic salvation by works alteration which despite its uncial and versional support, cannot possibly be right. The NIV/NASV translators did not translate literally here!*"

Dr Moorman has rightly observed what White tries to evade in his comments. Although the NASV and NIV translators have followed the text of the corrupt old uncials and modern critical texts, they have clearly attempted in their translation to avoid the implication of "*a "works-salvation" system,*" which the literal reading "*unto salvation*" unambiguously conveys. They have therefore taken liberties with the text in order to do so but even as the readings stands in the NASV, NIV, they could still be interpreted as supporting "*a "works-salvation" system*" instead of an exhortation "*to increase in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, and...grow up in the faith*" that White proposes. The expressions "*Grow in respect to*" and "*Grow up in*" are by inspection just as suggestive of a progressive salvation as they are of developing Christian maturity.

The AV1611 reading removes any ambiguity and as Dr Moorman states, is undoubtedly the correct reading, for that reason.

It is White who has actually misused the text of the old uncials in order to both justify the corrupt textual addition and the modern readings of the NASV and NIV.

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 219</sup> notes that, "*We are told in the Traditional Text [for 1 Peter 2:2] that as newborn babies in Christ we should "desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby."* The Greek phrase found in the Traditional Text reads *ina en auto auxethete (that ye may grow)*. The Critical Text adds *eis soterian (to salvation)* at the end of the phrase, suggesting that salvation is something we grow to. This is why the NRSV renders the phrase as "*that by it you may grow into salvation.*" Certainly the reading of the Traditional Text omits the confusion and provides a stronger Christology here regarding redemption."

Dr Ruckman<sup>144 p 247</sup> affirms that, his emphasis, "*Here in 1 Peter 2:2, the RSV reads, "Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up to salvation." That's works salvation. If you get saved, you get saved instantaneously, the moment you trust Christ as your Saviour. No one "grows up to salvation."*

*"The NASV and NIV have tried to cover up the heresy of the text which they translated (Nestlé's). The NASV text says, "grow up in respect to salvation." The NIV says, "grow up in your salvation." But those aren't translations. Those are paraphrases to make you think that the Westcott-Hort text of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus is an orthodox text.*

*“The Nestle’s text, which contains the Alexandrian reading, says, “εις σωτηριαν” (eis soterian). The “formal equivalence” (i.e. word-for-word) translation is “into” (or “unto”) “salvation.” A little problem with “the original text” there, eh what?*

*“Anything to get rid of the **King James** text!”*

White<sup>3 p 184-5</sup> disputes the AV1611 reading in 1 John 4:3 **“Jesus Christ is come in the flesh”** and insists that the modern reading of the NASV, NIV that omits **“Christ is come in the flesh”** is superior because *“The repetition of the phrase [“has come in the flesh”] in verse 3 was prompted by the second use of “confess” or “acknowledge.” This caused a number of variants, some reading simply “acknowledge Jesus Christ,” some, “acknowledge that Jesus has come in the flesh,” “Jesus the Lord has come in the flesh,” and the TR’s “Jesus Christ has come in the flesh.” Whenever one finds a number of different variants, one can be sure that the shorter reading (that of the modern texts) is the best, as it gave rise to all the others that are found in the manuscripts.”*

White’s assertion about *“the shorter reading”* is sheer speculation, as usual unaccompanied by evidence. Pickering<sup>1 p 109, 129 p 79-83</sup> has the following comments, with respect to the Westcott-Hort Theory, which White has slavishly adopted. See also remarks above concerning White’s notion<sup>3 p 155</sup> that Mark 15:28 was somehow ‘borrowed’ *“from Luke 22:37 or Isaiah 53:12.”*

*“Perhaps the canon most widely used against the “Byzantine” text is brevior lectio potior – the shorter reading is to be preferred. As Hort stated the alleged basis for the canon, “In the New Testament, as in almost all prose writings which have been copied, corruptions by interpolation [insertion of additional words in the text] are many times more numerous than corruptions by omission.” Accordingly it has been customary since Hort to tax the Received Text as being full and interpolated and to regard B and Aleph as prime examples of non-interpolated texts...*

*“But is it really true that interpolations are “many times more numerous” than omissions in the transmission of the New Testament? B. H. Streeter thought not. “Hort speaks of “the almost universal tendency of transcribers to make their text as full as possible, and to eschew omissions”; and infers that copyists would tend to prefer an interpolated to an uninterpolated text. This may be true of some of the local texts of the second century, it is the very opposite of the truth where scribes or editors trained in the tradition of Alexandrian textual criticism are concerned...That Christian scholars and scribes were capable of the same critical attitude we have irrefragable evidence...The notion is completely refuted that the regular tendency of scribes was to choose the longer reading, and that therefore the modern editor is therefore quite safe so long as he steadily rejects [the longer reading]...Now, whoever was responsible for it, the B [Vaticanus] text has been edited on the Alexandrian principle...”*

*““The whole question of interpolations in ancient MSS has been set in an entirely new light by the researches of Mr A. C. Clark, Corpus Professor of Latin at Oxford...In the Descent of Manuscripts, an investigation of the manuscript tradition of the Greek and Latin Classics, he proves conclusively that the error to which the scribes were most prone was not interpolation but accidental omission...Hitherto the maxim brevior lectio potior...has been assumed as a postulate of scientific criticism. Clark has shown that, so far as classical texts are concerned, the facts point entirely the other way.*

*““Burgon<sup>131 p 156</sup> had objected long before.*

*““How indeed can it possibly be more true to the infirmities of copyists, to the verdict of evidence on the several passages, and to the origin of the New Testament in the infancy of*

*the Church and amidst associations which were not literary, to suppose that a terse production was first produced and afterwards was amplified in a later age with a view to 'lucidity and completeness' [Westcott and Hort, Introduction, p. 134] rather than that words and clauses and sentences were omitted upon definitely understood principles in a small class of documents by careless or ignorant or prejudiced scribes?"*"

Burgon has clearly disposed of White's suppositions concerning "the shorter reading" before White even wrote them. Pickering then describes Colwell's "most significant study of scribal habits as illustrated by the three early papyri P45, P66, P75." See Pickering's remarks given earlier in this chapter. Pickering concludes after summarising Colwell's findings.

*"Here is a clear statistical demonstration that interpolations are **not** "many times more numerous" than omissions. Omission is more common as an unintentional error than addition, and P45 shows that with some scribes omissions were **deliberate** and extensive.*

See also Burgon's remarks above<sup>131 p 128-131</sup> in the comments on White's attempt to delete Mark 7:16 from the Holy Bible.

*"We have now to consider the largest of all classes of corrupt variations from the genuine Text, — the omission of words and clauses and sentences...*

*"The experience of copyists would pronounce that Omission is the besetting fault of transcribers."*

As Pickering noted from Streeter's work, "the facts point entirely the other way" from that which White is facing with respect to "the shorter reading."

As Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 245</sup> notes, his emphases, "It is  $\kappa$  and B that give you ALL of the "shorter readings" in White's book, where words, phrases, verses, and even whole passages (Acts 9) have been removed from **the correct text**."

*"The text of  $\kappa$  and B is scandalously CORRUPT<sup>13 p 33\*</sup> (2 Cor. 2:17)." Vercellone says that "No one could read ONE PAGE of [ms.] thirteen (Vaticanus) without finding three to four omissions."*

\*See Burgon's remarks quoted above in response to White's attempt to remove "for them that trust in riches" from Mark 10:24 and in **Chapter 3** with respect to  $\kappa$  and B.

White hasn't read any pages in Vaticanus, evidently. Nevertheless, he finds opportunity for yet another attack on Dr Mrs Riplinger, his emphases.

*"Despite the plain confession of the coming of Christ in the flesh that is found in all the Alexandrian and Western manuscripts at 1 John 4:2, and the faithful presentation of this truth in the NIV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, NEB, etc., KJV Only advocate Gail Riplinger can cite **only** verse 3, **never once mentioning verse 2**, and write..."*

White then reproduces a paragraph quotes Dr Mrs Riplinger's work<sup>14 p 351</sup> that reads in part as follows, her emphasis.

*"Bruce Metzger...picked the wrong verse to help create a slimline bible...By omitting "Christ" and "is come in the flesh," new versions are not confessing that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," as John says, "this is the spirit of antichrist." Readers, who subscribe to these "deceivers," may have full bookshelves instead of a "full reward."*

And White insists, his emphasis, that "The "deception" ...is being promulgated not by Dr Metzger or any of the men who have faithfully translated both 1 John 4:2 and 3 into Eng-



lish, but by KJV Only advocates who fail to give the whole story and, hence, present an unbalanced picture.”

Burton and Pickering have shown “*The “deception”*” that James White, Bruce Metzger and their allies have “*promulgated*” with respect to the bogus nature of “*the shorter reading*” as found repeatedly in modern versions of the New Testament. It will be seen with respect to 1 John 4:3 that it is this Satanic cadre, not bible believers, “*who fail to give the whole story and, hence, present an unbalanced picture.*”

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>62</sup> support the omission of “**Christ is come in the flesh,**” thus influencing Westcott and Hort’s RV and Nestle. However, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> maintain the lineage of the true reading in support of the AV1611 – and like the AV1611, all of these bibles read “**Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,**” not “*has come in the flesh,*” as White incorrectly quotes above. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s<sup>7 Part 4</sup> remarks below, her emphases. As usual, her painstaking research reveals much that White overlooked, including the observation that 1 John 4:2 still allows for “*a lying spirit*” 1 Kings 22:22 to be accepted as “*from God*” according to the NIV, provided it does, in fact, “*acknowledge Jesus.*” Such a spirit can get an individual killed, even a king, 1 Kings 22:35.

#### “WHITE’S WEAK THEOLOGY

“Scanning 1 John 4:2,3 in a new version will show how their wording fits precisely into the New Age One World Religion.

“ **NIV**

*This is how you can recognize the Spirit of God: Every spirit that **acknowledges** that Jesus Christ **has** come in the flesh is from God, **but** every spirit **that does not acknowledge Jesus** is not **from** God. This is the spirit of antichrist*

**KJV**

*Hereby **know** ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that **confesseth** that Jesus Christ **is** come in the flesh is of God: **And** every spirit that **confesseth** not that Jesus **Christ is come in the flesh** is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist...  
I John 4:2-3*

“The MAIN tenet of the New World Religion is TOLERANCE for the religious beliefs of others. Therefore Christians may still believe that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” as stated in verse 2 above. BUT the broad way forbids that we say that one who “confesseth **not** that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is **not** of God.” Therefore, 1 John 4:2 can stand with little alteration. BUT, 1 John 4:3 MUST change to conform to the unjudgmental broad way. “Christ is come in the **flesh**” must be removed. All New World Religion advocates will “acknowledge Jesus.”

“In addition, new versions deny Jesus Christ **IS** alive; note the change in verse 2 from “**is** come” to “has come.” Those who would deny the **bodily** resurrection of Jesus Christ could “acknowledge” (head knowledge) that he “has come.” (The difference between “acknowledge” and “confesseth” is apparent to anyone.) When Jesus was seen by Thomas, he said, “for a spirit hath not **flesh** and bones, as ye see me have.” (Of course the NIV and NASB omit Eph. 5:30 “of his flesh, and his bones” [White conveniently ignores this omission in his book]. New Greek text editor B. F. Westcott questioned the **bodily** resurrection of Jesus Christ; hence much that points to it has been removed.)

“In spite of **all** of the theological implications regarding the changes in new versions, Mr. White tells his reader it’s **OK** to omit “it” in verse 3 since “it’s” still in verse 2. He adds,

it's "hard to believe" KJV only advocates find the NIV wanting here. He ends noting, "one can almost be sure that the shorter reading (that of the modern texts) is the best..." Scholars disagree. A. C. Clark's *Descent of Manuscripts* notes, "errors to which scribes are most prone are omissions not interpolations." Colwell (past President of the University of Chicago), in his *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism*, says that the scribes of P45, P66, and P75 were "prone to lose their place in the text and consequently skip over words, phrases..."

"White closes his discussion of 1 John 4:2 and 3 charging "deception" and a "tremendously unbalanced picture" because New Age Bible Versions fails to give the "whole story," that being "its in verse 2." White's vacation Bible school exegesis is an embarrassment to the school from which he graduated. With "blind guides" like this, the new version advocates and New Agers will march hand in hand agreeing that those who do **NOT** confess "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" are **OK**. (This is called Inclusive Theology and fits in perfectly with what is taught at almost ALL of the seminaries at which new version editors teach.)"

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 147</sup> notes that the Peshitta Syriac joins with the majority of the Greek sources in support of the AV1611 reading, which include K, L, 049, 056, 0142, 0245. As indicated, the text of the Peshitta predates that of the old uncials A, B, Ψ that support the modern omission – White<sup>3 p 191</sup> informs the reader that Ⲙ has a reading similar to the AV1611, "Jesus the Lord has come in the flesh." His "great codex" let him down on this occasion.

Dr Moorman notes no variant readings among the large number of witnesses in favour of the AV1611, so White's comments are misleading in this respect. Whatever variant readings exist for 1 John 4:3, they are relatively few in number.

However, the 6 extant Old Latin copies manifest the omission along with most of the Vulgate (an early Vulgate manuscript contains the reading) and must have influenced Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, whose bible also omits "**Christ is come in the flesh.**" Nevertheless, Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 59</sup> refers to Polycarp (69-156 AD), Cyprian (200-258 AD) and Tertullian (160-220 AD) in support of the AV1611, proving that the AV1611 reading cannot have been a later insertion, as White assumes.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 147</sup> comments with respect to 1 John 4:3, "This passage strikes at the chief heresy concerning the Person of Christ, i.e. that a man named Jesus of Nazareth became the Christ at his baptism. He was not the Christ prior to that event. This "depth of Satan" has continued in varied expressions down to our day, and is the root of what lies behind modern publications as "From Jesus to Christ" by Paula Fredrikson (Yale University Press). It is the primary reason for the dissociation between "Jesus" and "Christ" in certain early manuscripts."

Dr Holland<sup>3 p 11-12, 47-8</sup> agrees with Dr Moorman that the expression "**Christ is come in the flesh**" in 1 John 4:3 in the AV1611 has early support.

He states, his emphases, "The biblical quotation Polycarp (70 to 155 AD) uses to confront Gnosticism is a citation from the Traditional Text. 1 John 4:3 reads, "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." The Alexandrian line does not contain the phrase "is come in the flesh" in verse three. The verse deals with the lack of confession, not the believer's profession found in verse two. As quoted above, Polycarp writes that "every one who shall note confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," agreeing with the Traditional Text.

“Some have suggested that Polycarp is really citing 2 John 7 and not 1 John 4:3. This does not seem to have been the view of the renowned New Testament and patristic scholar J. B. Lightfoot. In his book, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Lightfoot identifies the quotation as being from 1 John 4:3, as does Archbishop Wake in his translation of Polycarp. Their observations are well taken as the Greek of 1 John 4:3 more closely matches the Greek citation of Polycarp...

“1 John and Polycarp use the **perfect tense** [“in flesh come”], 2 John uses the **present tense** [“coming” or “is come in flesh”]. The perfect tense means a present state resulting from a past action (i.e. because Christ came in the flesh, he is now in the flesh). Clearly Polycarp was citing 1 John 4:3, which matches the Traditional Text.”

White’s next attack<sup>3 p 185, 191</sup> on the AV1611 Text focuses on Revelation 1:11, where White objects to the phrases “**I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and**” and “**which are in Asia,**” omitted by the modern versions, NASV, NIV.

He states, his emphasis, “The TR’s inclusion of the phrase is based upon a minority of the Majority text, while the rest of the Majority text joins both *α* and *Ω* in not containing the obvious addition, drawn from Revelation 22:13. But for KJV Only advocates the modern versions are again somehow “denying” the deity of Christ by having the phrase at 1:8 and 22:13 but not at 1:11.

“The addition of “in Asia” is based upon very few manuscripts. Hoskier cites 57, 59, 141, and 187 as the only supporting manuscripts; 57 and 141 are almost certainly copies of Erasmus’ text, hence one is left with only two manuscripts in support of this reading...”

If the phrase “**I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and**” is such an “obvious addition, drawn from Revelation 22:13,” why was the middle portion “**the beginning and the end**” omitted from Revelation 1:11? White fails to address this obvious question and again gives neither coherent evidence nor satisfactory explanation to support his wild speculations about the TR and the AV1611 Text. His opinion on the wording of Revelation 1:11 must be rejected as spurious on these grounds alone but more evidence can be adduced in favour of the verse as found in the AV1611.

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit both phrases from Revelation 1:11, which are therefore not found in either Westcott and Hort’s RV or Nestle. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits the first phrase.

Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 80</sup> reveals that of the precursors to the AV1611, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Great, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all agree with the AV1611 with respect to both phrases, together with the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever. Wycliffe’s New Testament, influenced no doubt by the Old Latin in addition to the Vulgate<sup>11 p 80</sup>, includes the words “*that are in Asia,*” indicating early attestation in support of the AV1611 reading.

The difference therefore lies between the modern bible rejecting critics – see remarks under *Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness* – and faithful bible believers who compiled these early English versions. Which group would consist of those “*in whom the LORD put wisdom and understanding to know how to work all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary, according to all that the LORD had commanded*” Exodus 36:1?

Dr Moorman lists 30 cursives that contain the phrase “**I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and**” and states “most of the Andreas mss. [the basis for the AV1611 Text of Revelation]. About 57 of Hoskier’s cursives” in support of the AV1611. He adds,

*“Many of the above witnesses have minor variations. This serves to demonstrate that they are not copies of each other but represent long lines of transmission,”* longer, it would appear, than the corrupt line starting with Codex  $\kappa$  that omits the phrase. Dr Moorman also includes patristic support for the AV1611 reading from Andreas of Cappadocia, d. 614 AD.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 3</sup> summarises, her emphases.

*“White misrepresents the MS evidence for Rev. 1:11...*

*“Contrary to White's error, the facts reveal that the phrase is in 57 of Hoskier's cursives; it is in **most** of the Andreas line (about 80 MSS). Note P. 1, 42, 61, 104, 336, 628, 2019, 2020, 2023, 2057, and Von Soden's Ia (181, 296, 432, 598, 743, 2026, 2031, 2033, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2060, 2064, 2067, 2068, 2069), I b2 (104, 459, 922). Andreas, [of] Cappadocia, died 614. Also including the phrase are men like Tyndale, Stephens, Beza, Elzevir, (Geneva), (Bishops) - men who had access to even **more** versions and manuscripts...*

*“Once again, White's lack of familiarity with the debates and collations within the field of textual criticism, has led him to make false statements. White, like Ankerberg, Hane-graaff, McMahon, and others who pretend to be an expert in **all** fields, becomes a “jack-of-all-trades and a master of none.””*

Refuting White's opinion that only very few manuscripts support the phrase *“**which are in Asia,**”* Dr Moorman refers to *“about 10 of Hoskier's cursives”* and specifically lists 3; 296, 1894, 2066. He also refers to the Venerable Bede, d. 735 AD as giving support for this phrase, from Latin sources. Even if these consisted mainly of the Vulgate, this document, commissioned in 383 AD<sup>9 p 31-2</sup>, must have been translated from manuscripts contemporaneous with Codex  $\kappa$  and may even reflect the Old Latin text, which predates Codex  $\kappa$ .

The modern versions produce a misleading result by omitting the phrase *“**which are in Asia**”* from Revelation 1:11. These versions imply that only 7 principal churches existed when the Lord commanded John to write the Book of Revelation, which as Paul's letters show, cannot be true.

White's last objection to the AV1611 in this chapter is with respect to Revelation 19:1, where the AV1611 has *“**the Lord our God,**”* whereas the modern versions, NASV, NIV, omit *“**the Lord.**”*

White says that *“The Alexandrian text joins with part of the Byzantine text in having simply “our God,” while the other section of the Byzantine has “the Lord our God.” If someone were to assert that the modern texts are detracting from God's glory by not having “Lord,” [White is here detracting from God's glory himself, the omission is **“the Lord,”** not simply “Lord,” 1 Corinthians 8:5b] does it follow that all the Byzantine texts that likewise do not have “Lord” [White detracts again from God's glory, the second time in the same sentence] are also part of this grand conspiracy?”*

At this particular point, yes. It is useful to provide an answer to White's question since he is unable to do so himself.

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit *“**the Lord**”* and therefore both the RV and Nestle omit the words, setting the trend for the NASV, NIV, James White and his nefarious cronies, e.g. Doug Kutilek, Bruce Metzger etc. – see Cloud's comments below.

Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 106</sup> lists 14 Andreas cursives that contain **“the Lord”** together with the patristic citation of Andreas of Cappadocia, d. 614 AD. Wycliffe’s New Testament<sup>46</sup> does not contain the words but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Great, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all agree with the AV1611, along with the editions of Stephanus, Beza and Eleziever.

Once again, by inspection of the competing sources, bible believers are in the company of those **“in whom the LORD put wisdom and understanding to know how to work all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary, according to all that the LORD had commanded”** Exodus 36:1.

White<sup>3 p 186-7</sup> closes this chapter effectively with a load of ‘whitewash’ aimed at justifying the modern – and ancient - attacks on **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21, as now embodied in its fully refined form as the finally authoritative 1611 Authorised Holy Bible, rightly perceived as **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16, entire, whole and perfect as such.

White and his allies would of course vehemently deny the above statement but his concluding remarks reveal that he has no appeal except to bible rejecting critics like himself, his emphasis.

*“Those who use [not “believe”] a modern translation [unspecified – yet more may appear, well over 100 having emerged in the last century<sup>63</sup>] that was produced by godly men [“heady, high minded” 2 Timothy 3:4 bible rejecters who were mostly unregenerate; Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Westcott, Hort, Nestle, Aland, Metzger<sup>3 p 151, 179, 185</sup> etc. – see below for Cloud’s researches on Metzger’s ‘godliness’] who were seeking simply to follow the best texts of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament [i.e. the<sup>13 p 16</sup> “scandalously corrupt” Codices 8 and B], and to faithfully translate those texts into the English language, can have great confidence [but not **“infallible proofs”** Acts 1:3] that they are reading God’s Word in the best form in which it can be found [so far – **“the work of translation is never wholly finished”** NIV Preface] in their language [and White and co. stand ready to dispense an ‘improved’ form, as necessary, owing to their superior command of **“the best texts”** in Hebrew and Greek]. *The comparison of these translations against one another only serves to sharpen our understanding of the intention of the original authors* [not for James White. He was wrong about **“the intention of the original authors”** with respect to Romans 1:18, 1 Thesalonians 5:22 and all other verses he mentioned in his chapter on *Translation Differences*. See **Chapter 6**. And he was wrong<sup>3 p 156-9</sup> in his opinions of **“What did the original author write?”** with respect to Matthew 1:25, 8:29, 20:16, 25:13, 27:35, Mark 6:11, 10:21, John 5:4, Colossians 1:14 and all other AV1611 readings that he disputed in this chapter]. *And when textual variants appear...believers [in what?] can be assured that these things arose not because of some attempt to hide the truth from them, but due to the very understandable actions of scribes down through the centuries who were themselves doing their best to accurately copy those precious manuscripts* [so why did the majority of the manuscripts underlying the TR and the AV1611 exhibit variants that are **“extremely few and often trivial”** according to a Master of Theology<sup>8 p 115</sup> who studied them and why did White’s ‘great codices’ 8 and B<sup>3 p 33</sup> turn out to be **“scandalously corrupt”** and honeycombed with inconsistencies, according to a genuine scholar who studied them? See Burgon’s analysis in the **Summary, Introduction** and in **Chapter 3**]. *Rather than being fearful [bible believers aren’t] that they can’t be “certain” about what God has revealed, they should rejoice that God has made it possible for them to have and to hold His Word [between which two covers?], and they should seek to obey His will that is so clearly presented therein [between which two covers?]. The preacher and teacher can**

*proclaim God's truth* [The Lord Jesus Christ said, "**Thy word is truth**" John 17:17. Where, specifically, is "**thy word**" between two covers?] *from the pages of such a translation* [Which translation? White has just urged for "*The comparison of these translations* [plural!] *against one another.*" Which one now takes pre-eminence and why?] *with the full assurance that he is proclaiming the whole counsel of God* [from between which two covers?], *and can trust God with the results.*"

Which are? White does not say but Dr Gipp<sup>31 p 113</sup>, despised by White et alia, *does* and in no uncertain fashion. See also ***Revision's Romanizing Aftermath***.

*"Today's modern translations haven't been able to spark a revival in a Christian school, let alone be expected to close a bar. In fact, since the arrival of our modern English translations, beginning with the ASV of 1901, America has seen:*

1. *God and prayer kicked out of our public school.*
2. *Abortion on demand legalised.*
3. *Homosexuality accepted nationally as an "alternate life style".*
4. *In home pornography via TV and VCR.*
5. *Child kidnapping and pornography running rampant.*
6. *Dope has become an epidemic.*
7. *Satanism is on the rise.*

*"If this is considered a "revival" then let's turn back to the King James to STOP it."*

As indicated, Cloud<sup>6 Parts 1, 2</sup> has some informative findings, on the "godly men" who accessed "*the best texts*" in order to "*faithfully translate those texts into the English language.*"

Note also Cloud's comments on White's preference for "*the shorter reading.*" See also comments above.

***"WHITE ASSUMES THAT BIBLE EDITORS AND TRANSLATORS ARE ALWAYS SINCERE AND DISCOUNTS THE FEAR THAT THE BIBLE HAS BEEN CORRUPTED.***

*"From beginning to end of this book, White works from the faulty assumption that differences in the texts and versions are based largely on honest mistakes by sincere transcribers. Consider some examples of this:*

*"And when textual variants appear in footnotes or in comparison with the KJV, believers can be assured that these things arose not because of some attempt to hide the truth from them, but due to the very understandable actions of scribes down through the centuries who were themselves doing their best to accurately copy those precious manuscripts" (White, pp. 186, 187).*

*"In either case, no malicious intention can be asserted one way or the other" (White, p. 178).*

*"... there is no logical reason to impute evil motives to these translations" (White, p. 176).*

*"Whenever one finds a number of different variants, one can be sure that the shorter reading (that of the modern texts) is the best, as it gave rise to all the others that are found in the manuscripts" (White, p. 185).*

*“Of course, White cannot prove any of these statements. He does not know who these allegedly sincere scribes were. He cannot even give us their names, yet he pretends he knows the very motives of their hearts!*

*“Note, too, that White accepts the assumption of modern textual criticism that the “shorter reading” is the most accurate, that the longer reading is usually a later scribal addition. They use this rule, not because they can prove that it is true, but because it conveniently supports the critical text and negates the longer Received Text. This “shorter reading” theory, and the assumption that textual changes were created by sincere men, are contrary to the testimony of Scripture. The Bible warns that the Devil hates the Word of God, that he has been attacking it ever since his conversation with Eve in the Garden of Eden. In the first century, even as the New Testament Scripture was being given, the Apostles were already hounded by false teachers who were corrupting the Word of God (2 Cor. 2:17). This attack increased tremendously during the next two centuries. The Lord Jesus and the Apostles warned repeatedly that false teachers would attempt to corrupt the truth (i.e., Matt. 7:15; 24:3-5, 11, 24; 2 Cor. 11:1-15; Gal. 1:6-9; Col. 2:8; 1 Tim. 4:1-4; 2 Tim. 3:13; 2 Pet. 2:1-22; 1 John 2:18-26; 4:1; Jude 4). Church history bears out these warnings...*

*“THE THEOLOGICAL APOSTASY WHICH HAS CHARACTERIZED MODERN TEXTUAL CRITICISM REQUIRES THAT WE REJECT THE MODERN TEXTS AND VERSIONS. The most influential textual scholars have been rationalists who rejected the inerrant inspiration of Holy Scripture. That is a documented fact. I have hundreds of books in my library by textual scholars dating from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and I have documented the apostasy underlying the modern textual scholarship in our book *Myths about Modern Versions (Way of Life Literature)*. There are exceptions, of course, but the exceptions do not overthrow the rule. Since James White pretends these ideas are the brainchildren of feverish fundamental Baptists, we will quote several men of former times and of other denominational persuasions to demonstrate our point...*

*“Let me summarize my findings about the history of the modern versions. First of all, most of the key textual critics of the 19<sup>th</sup> century rejected the doctrine of biblical inerrancy. This category includes J. L. Hug (1765-1846), Carl Lachmann (1793-1851), Johann Griesbach (1745-1812), Friedrich Tischendorf (1815-1874), B. F. Westcott (1825-1901) and F. J. A. Hort (1828-1892). Of the work of these men, Robert L. Dabney, 19<sup>th</sup>-century Presbyterian scholar, testified: “We shall find them continually varying, each one obnoxious to grave objections, and the question still unsettled...Their common traits may be said to be an almost contemptuous dismissal of the received text, as unworthy not only of confidence, but almost of notice” (Dabney, “The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek,” *Discussions Evangelical and Theological*, pp. 350,52,54; this first appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April 1871)...*

*“Of Westcott and Hort, who produced the Greek text underlying the Revised Version of 1881, Dallas Seminary professor Zane Hodges warned in 1971: “The charge of rationalism is easily substantiated for Westcott and Hort and may be demonstrated from direct statements found in their introduction to *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. To begin with, Westcott and Hort are clearly unwilling to commit themselves to the inerrancy of the original Scriptures...Modern textual criticism is psychologically ‘addicted’ to Westcott and Hort. Westcott and Hort, in turn, were rationalists in their approach to the textual problem in the New Testament and employed techniques within which rationalism and every other kind of bias are free to operate” (Hodges, “Rationalism and Contempo-*

rary New Testament Textual Criticism,” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Dallas Seminary, January 1971, pp. 27-35)...

“Continuing to follow the stream of apostasy underlying the modern texts and versions, we come to *THE EDITORS OF THE UNITED BIBLE SOCIETIES GREEK NEW TESTAMENT*, which is the predominant critical Greek text used in colleges and seminaries today. The editors include *BRUCE METZGER*, *CARLO MARTINI*, *EUGENE NIDA*, and *KURT ALAND*. Not one of these men believes the Bible is the infallible, inerrant Word of God. Martini is an Archbishop in the Catholic Church, the head of the largest Catholic diocese in the world. Metzger works [until his death in February 2007 - Wikipedia] for the National Council of Churches in America and promotes the modernistic historical-critical views of the Old Testament. Eugene Nida is one of the fathers of the destructive modern theories of dynamic equivalency. Kurt Aland [1915-1994], co-editor of the Nestle-Aland Greek text since the 1940s, claims the canon of Scripture is not settled and believes the settling of this “question” is a key to the ecumenical unity between churches, denominations, and schools which he desires to see (Aland, *The Problem of the New Testament Canon*, 1962, pp. 30-33). In our books *For Love of the Bible* and *Myths of Modern Versions* we have documented the heresies of these men from their own writings...

“Another unscriptural heretic who is popular with Evangelicals is *BRUCE METZGER*. The February 8, 1999, issue of *Christianity Today* contains an editorial by Michael Maudlin, Managing Editor, entitled “Inside CT.” Maudlin’s editorial boasts that “never before in the twentieth century has the church amassed so many highly skilled, believing scholars to illumine our Scriptures, our theology, our traditions, our church work.” Who are these “believing scholars”? He mentions five of them: Craig Blomberg, Bruce Metzger, Edwin Yamauchi, Ben Witherington III, and D. A. Carson.

“Maudlin’s definition of “believing” is strange. Take Metzger, for example. He is a Princeton Theological Seminary professor, an editor of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament, and the head of the continuing RSV translation committee of the apostate National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. The Revised Standard Version was soundly condemned for its modernism when it first appeared in 1952. Today its chief editor sometimes is invited to speak at Evangelical forums. The RSV hasn’t changed, but Evangelicalism certainly has! Metzger was the chairman for the Reader’s Digest Condensed Bible and wrote the introductions to each book in this butchered version of the Scriptures. In these, Metzger questions the authorship, traditional date, and supernatural inspiration of books penned by Moses, Daniel, and Peter, and in many other ways reveals his liberal, unbelieving heart. Consider three examples:

“Genesis: “Nearly all modern scholars agree that, like the other books of the Pentateuch, [Genesis] is a composite of several sources, embodying traditions that go back in some cases to Moses” (Metzger’s introduction to Exodus).

“Exodus: “As with Genesis, several strands of literary tradition, some very ancient, some as late as the sixth century B.C., were combined in the makeup of the books” (Metzger’s introduction to Exodus).

“Deuteronomy: “It’s compilation is generally assigned to the seventh century B.C., though it rests upon much older tradition, some of it from Moses’ time” (Metzger’s introduction to Deuteronomy).

“These statements are not “believing” statements. They are outright lies and heresy. Bruce Metzger is an unbelieving heretic. The Lord Jesus Christ and the Apostles told us



*that the Pentateuch was written by the historical Moses (who is mentioned 843 times in the Bible). It is not a compilation that gradually took shape over many centuries.*

*“We know that Moses wrote the Pentateuch for the following simple reasons:*

*“1. The books themselves claim to have been written by Moses (Ex. 24:4, 7; 34:27-28; Nu. 33:2; De. 1:1-5; 4:4-5; 31:9-12, 24-26). If Moses did not write the Pentateuch, the Bible is an absolute lie from its beginning.*

*“2. Other O.T. books claim Moses wrote the Pentateuch (Jos. 1:7; 8:30-35; Jud. 3:4; 1 Ki. 2:3; 2 Ki. 14:6; 22:8-11; 23:21-25; Ezra 3:2; Neh. 8:1; 9:14; Dan. 9:11; Mal. 4:4). If Moses did not write the Pentateuch, all of these writers were either deluded or were lying. Either way, we are left with a hopelessly undependable book which is not the blessed Word of God.*

*“3. The New Testament claims Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Moses is mentioned 80 times in the New Testament (Mk. 12:26; Lk. 16:29-31; 24:27 [Moses’ writings are called Scripture]; 24:44; Jn. 1:17; 5:45-47; 8:5; Ac. 15:21; 2 Co. 3:15).*

*“The Lord Jesus Christ quoted from every part of the Pentateuch: Genesis (Mt. 19:4-6; 24:37-39); Exodus (Mk. 12:26 citing Ex. 3:6); Leviticus (Mt. 8:4 citing Lev. 14:1-32); Numbers (Jn. 3:14-15 citing Num. 21:8,9 and Jn. 6:31-32 citing Num. 11:6-9); Deuteronomy (Mk. 10:4-5 citing Deut. 24:1).*

*“Metzger’s heresy is further evident in the notes to the New Oxford Annotated Bible RSV (1973). Metzger co-edited this volume with Herbert May. It first appeared in 1962 as the Oxford Annotated Bible and was the first Protestant annotated edition of the Bible to be approved by a Roman Catholic authority. It was given an imprimatur in 1966 by Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, Massachusetts. Metzger wrote many of the rationalistic notes in this volume and put his editorial stamp of approval on the rest. The notes claim that the Pentateuch is “a matrix of myth, legend, and history” that “took shape over a long period of time” and is “not to be read as history.” The worldwide flood of Noah’s day is said to be a mere “tradition” based on “heightened versions of local inundations.” The book of Job is called an “ancient folktale.” The book of Isaiah is said to have been written by at least three men. The stories of Elijah and Elisha contain “legendary elements.” Jonah is called a “popular legend.” The Gospels gradually took shape after the deaths of the Apostles. Peter probably did not write the book of 2 Peter.*

*“These statements are unbelieving lies. The Pentateuch was written by the hand of God and Moses and completed during the 40 years of wilderness wandering hundreds of years before Samuel and the kings. The Old Testament did not arise gradually from a matrix of myth and history, but is inspired revelation delivered to holy men of old by Almighty God. The Jews were a “people of the book” from the beginning. The Jewish nation did not form the Bible; the Bible formed the Jewish nation! Jesus Christ affirmed the historicity of Jonah. The historicity of Job is affirmed by Ezekiel (14:14,20) and James (5:11).*

*“In his “Introduction to the New Testament” in the New Oxford Annotated Bible, Metzger completely ignores the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and claims that the Gospels are composed of material gathered from oral tradition. The Bible says nothing about this, but Jesus Christ plainly tells us that the Holy Spirit would guide the Apostles into all truth (John 16:7-15). The Gospels are divine revelation, not some happenstance editing of oral tradition.*

*“Christianity Today calls Bruce Metzger a “believing scholar.” In reality, he is an unbelieving heretic, and the fact that so many Evangelical leaders recommend his writings is a testimony to the apostasy of Evangelicalism today.”*

With reference to his defence of Bruce Metzger, White<sup>3 p 185</sup> earlier denigrated *“KJV Only advocates who fail to give the whole story and, hence, present an unbalanced picture.”*

Readers are left to draw their own conclusions.

Note that, later in this work, Tables 2-9 provide summary comparisons between the AV1611 and the pre-1611 and post-1611 bibles for the main AV1611 readings that White criticises in this and subsequent chapters. See the end of *Chapters 8, 9* and *Part 2* for these tables, also *Table A1, Appendix*.

### **Chapter 8 - “The Son of God, the Lord of Glory”**

White uses this chapter to justify the efforts of ancient bible corrupters and modern bible critics to downgrade the Lord Jesus Christ in their texts.

He writes<sup>3 p 193-5</sup>, his emphasis, “*The deity of Christ* [White uses a small ‘d’ for “*deity*,” noteworthy in his book because he makes an issue out of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s small ‘b’ for “*bible*.”<sup>3 p 122, note 10</sup>]...*is just this doctrine of the Christian faith that is used as one of the primary tools of the KJV Only advocates who wish to impress upon Christians the importance of using only the KJV* [White avoids the word ‘believe’]. *Every KJV Only publication will make the same accusation: “The modern translations and the corrupted texts upon which they are based deny the deity of Christ and attack His Person.” Entire lists of references are then provided, all of which use the KJV as the standard of comparison, that allegedly show that the modern translations are either weak in their affirmation of the deity of Christ, or seek to deny this truth.*

*“We come then to examine the allegations that are made with great regularity against the modern translations...”*

White then reproduces the list of 23 verses beginning with Matthew 4:18 that he compiled in his Chapter 3 in an effort to ‘prove’ that<sup>3 p 195-6</sup> “*the Byzantine-text-type has longer titles for the Lord Jesus in comparison with the Alexandrian or Western types*” because, supposedly, “*the later manuscripts show evidence of the ‘expansion of piety.’*” Again, White supplies no evidence that such an ‘expansion’ ever took place. By contrast, the evidence for the corruption of certain early manuscripts with respect to subversion of the doctrine that the Lord Jesus Christ is “**God...manifest in the flesh**” 1 Timothy 3:16 is substantial and has been summarised in **Chapter 3**.

In addition, Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 629ff</sup> shows that of the verses that White lists, Mark 10:52, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 9:1, 16:22, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 12 have support from the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible with respect to the AV1611 readings. She<sup>39 p 721, 735</sup> also lists Matthew 12:25, Luke 24:36 as having support from the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bibles. These references are sample verses. Dr Mrs Riplinger did not compile them explicitly to counter White’s list but nevertheless, they provide ancient support for 9 of the 23 verse he lists, or almost 40%.

Moreover, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> Bibles all support the AV1611 in these verses; Matthew 4:18, 12:25, Luke 24:36, Acts 15:11, 19:10, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 16:22, 2 Corinthians 11:31, 1 Thessalonians 3:11, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 12, 1 John 1:7, Revelation 12:17. This is 13 of the 23 verses that White lists, or well over half.

Wycliffe omits the first “**Jesus**” in Mark 2:15, second “**Jesus**” in Mark 10:52, “**Christ**” in Acts 16:31, 19:4, second “**Christ**” in 1 Corinthians 5:4, “**the Lord**” in 2 Corinthians 4:10, “**Jesus**” in 2 Corinthians 5:18, “**Christ**” in Hebrews 3:1, “**the Lord**” in 2 John 3, second “**Christ**” in Revelation 1:9.

Tyndale omits “**Christ**” in Acts 16:31, thus supporting the AV1611 in 22 of the 23 verses that White lists. The Geneva and the Bishops’ Bibles support the AV1611 in all 23 verses and overall, this comparison reveals that the texts of bible believers down through the centuries, as preserved in the faithful precursors to the AV1611 overwhelmingly support the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible, not the modern versions.

A further comparison is also revealing, between the Catholic Latin Vulgate<sup>142</sup> of Jerome and the NIV, both the 1978 and the current online versions and the NASV, both the 1977 and the current online versions.

Matthew 4:18, the NIV includes “*Jesus*,” the Vulgate omits “*Jesus.*” The 1977 NASV omits “*Jesus*,” the current online version includes “*Jesus.*”

Matthew 12:25, Luke 24:36, the NIV and the Vulgate include “*Jesus.*” The 1977 NASV omits “*Jesus*” from Matthew 12:25, the current online version includes “*Jesus*” in Matthew 12:25. Both NASVs omit “*Jesus*” from Luke 24:36.

Mark 2:15, the NIV, NASV and the Vulgate omit the second “*Jesus.*”

Mark 10:52, the NIV includes the second “*Jesus*,” the NASV and the Vulgate omit the second “*Jesus.*”

Acts 19:10, 2 Corinthians 5:18, the NIV, NASV and the Vulgate omit “*Jesus.*”

Acts 15:11, 16:31, 19:4, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Corinthians 11:31, 1 Thessalonians 3:11, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 12, Hebrews 3:1, 1 John 1:7, Revelation 12:17, the NIV, the NASV and the Vulgate omit “*Christ.*”

1 Corinthians 5:4, the NIV, NASV omit “*Christ*” twice, the Vulgate omits “*Christ*” once.

1 Corinthians 16:22, the NIV, NASV omit “*Jesus Christ*,” the Vulgate includes “*Jesus Christ.*”

2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 John 3, the NIV, NASV and the Vulgate omit “*the Lord.*”

Revelation 1:9, the NIV, NASV and the Vulgate omit “*Christ*” twice.

The 23 verses in White’s list include 25 references to “*Jesus*,” “*Christ*,” “*the Lord*” and “*Jesus Christ.*”

The NIV omits 21 references, the 1977 NASV omits all 25 references, the current online NASV omits 23 references and the Vulgate omits 21 references. This result strongly indicates that the NIV and NASV are Catholic bibles like the Vulgate, although the NASV omits even more of the Lord’s names and titles than the Vulgate and only slight adjustments have been made in the latest edition.

Note further that the Wycliffe New Testament omits 10 of the Lord’s names and titles from the 23 verses in White’s list, or less than half of those omitted by the NIV, NASV and the Vulgate. This result agrees with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s<sup>39 p 788ff</sup> findings that Wycliffe’s Bible was *not* based on a corrupt Latin Vulgate. The differences between the Wycliffe Bible and the AV1611 may have resulted from changes made under duress<sup>39 p 777, 873-4</sup> in Wycliffe’s text by his secretaries, John Purvey and Nicholas of Hereford<sup>8 p 21</sup> to match Jerome’s Vulgate.

Having failed to address any of the above, White baldly asserts that, “*the terms “Lord” and “Christ” are used with great frequency in the non-Byzantine texts of the New Testament (a fact that KJV Only writers do not wish to communicate in their works).*” White’s assertion is an outrageous lie. See Salliby’s comments<sup>61 p 66-7</sup> in **Chapter 3**.

Dr Hills’s comment<sup>65 p 110</sup> is worth reiterating, with respect to White’s notions of ‘expansions of piety.’ See **Chapter 5**, with respect to White’s attack on Dr Mrs Riplinger.

*“This suggestion leads to conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent. It would have us believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the True Text was not restored until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope’s library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a waste basket on Mt. Sinai, and when Westcott and Hort were providentially guided to construct a theory of it which ignores God’s special providence and treats the text of the New Testament like the*

*text of any other ancient book. But if the True New Testament Text was lost for 1500 years, how can we be sure that it has ever been found again?"*

A searching question that White cannot realistically answer. He maintains, *"There is no "conspiracy" on the part of the modern Greek texts to hide or downplay the majesty or deity of the Lord Jesus through the "deletion" of His titles."*

Again, White is lying. He compounds his lie by resorting to the bogus chart<sup>8 p 306-308, 14 p 369-371</sup> originating with D. A. Carson (whom White fails to identify with respect to this chart), about which he states, *"The "bent" of the translation committee can be rather quickly identified by checking how the translators handle key passages such as John 1:1-3; Acts 20:28; Romans 9:5; Philippians 2:5-11; Colossians 1:15-17; Titus 2:13; and 2 Peter 1:1."*

White compounds his lie<sup>3 p 219</sup> in a note, *"Each of the passages in the chart is mistranslated in the NWT to hide the deity of Christ. The doctrinal bias against the Trinity that is part of Watchtower theology forces them to mistranslate the Bible so as to support their beliefs. Obviously, then, the translators of such modern versions as the NIV or NASB do not have the kind of bias that KJV Only advocates would have us believe."*

Again, White does not specify what is *"the Bible"* and neither does he inform the reader of precisely whom he means by the term *"us."*

Nor does White inform the reader that of the 241 passages of scripture, many of which address important doctrine, with which he compares the AV1611 mostly unfavourably with the NIV, the NIV agrees with the NWT in 192 of them *against* the AV1611, *or in 80%*. See **Appendix, Tables A1-A4**.

It would therefore appear that *"the translators of such modern versions as the NIV or NASB" do "have the kind of bias that KJV Only advocates [i.e. bible believers] would have us believe."*

As noted earlier – see **Chapter 4 - "A false balance is abomination to the LORD"** Proverbs 11:1a.

White insists further that *"anyone who has spent a great deal of time sharing the gospel with people who deny the deity of Jesus Christ, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, knows that using a modern translation such as the NIV makes one's work much easier. Why? The following chart will explain."*

He then inserts the bogus chart originating with D. A. Carson – see above. According to White's, i.e. Carson's, chart, consisting of 12 passages of scripture,

In 5 of these passages of scripture; John 1:1, 20:28, Acts 20:28, Colossians 1:15-17, Hebrews 1:8 are *"clear"* in each of the three versions with respect to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, i.e. the AV1611, NIV, NASV.

In one passage, John 1:18, the Lord's Deity is *"clear"* in the NIV, NASV but *"absent"* in the AV1611.

In one passage, Romans 9:5, the Lord's Deity is *"clear"* in the NIV but *"ambiguous"* in the NASV and in the AV1611.

In one passage, Philippians 2:5, 6, the Lord's Deity is *"most clear"* in the NIV, *"clear"* in the NASV and *"least clear"* in the AV1611.

In 3 passages, Colossians 2:9, Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, the Lord's Deity is *"clear"* in the NIV, NASV but *"ambiguous"* in the AV1611.

In one passage, 1 Timothy 3:16, the Lord's Deity is "*absent*" in the NIV, NASV but "*clear*" in the AV1611.

In sum, the NIV is, according to White, "*clear*" in 11 passages and the "*most clear*" in one of them, Philippians 2:5, 6, the NASV "*clear*" in 10 passages and the AV1611 "*clear*" in only 7 passages, being the "*least clear*" in one of them, Philippians 2:5, 6.

White concludes that, his emphasis "*the NIV's 'Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God a thing to be grasped' at Philippians 2:6 is clearer than the KJV's ambiguous translation, 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.' And the NASB's 'our God and Savior, Jesus Christ' at 2 Peter 1:1 is clearer than the KJV's 'of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.' In any case, we can see that the NIV provides the clearest translations of the passages that teach the deity of Christ; the NASB just a bit less so and the KJV the least of the three...*"

*"If there was an effort on the part of the modern translations...to downplay the deity of Christ, charts such as the above could not be constructed. Such a bias would be exhibited throughout a translation, and such is simply not the case. Therefore we can conclude that any...assertion of a bias against the deity or majesty of the Lord Jesus in the modern Greek texts or translations are without merit."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals, her emphases, that the modern "*bias against the deity or majesty of the Lord Jesus*" is far from being a mere "*assertion*" by "*KJV Only advocates.*"

She also demonstrates that White is lying with respect to the NIV's supposed effectiveness with respect to "*sharing the gospel with people who deny the deity of Jesus Christ, such as Jehovah's Witnesses.*"

*"White may 'come to you in sheep's clothing' in his city's phone directory, as Alpha Omega. But inwardly, underneath the covers of his NIV, the words 'I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last...' have been ravenously removed from Rev. 1:11. 'Ye shall know them by their fruits.'"*

*"The accompanying chart shows just **some** of the **other** barren spots in his NIV in that **one** chapter alone, Revelation 1. The deity of Christ is uprooted **seven** times in one chapter. A second insert 'How to Lead a J.W. to Christ' shows how the NIV's thorny hedges bar a seeker's path to salvation."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger lists the corrupted verses as follows, with the NIV reading followed by the AV1611 reading.

Revelation 1:4, "*seven spirits*" versus "*seven Spirits,*"

Revelation 1:6, "*his God and Father*" versus "*God and his Father,*" i.e. God, not simply the 'Christian God' for the New Age,

Revelation 1:9, "*Jesus...Jesus*" versus "*Jesus Christ...Jesus Christ,*"

Revelation 1:11, "[omission]" versus "*I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last,*"

Revelation 1:13, "*a son of man*" versus "*the Son of man.*"

Dr Mrs Riplinger then outlines the steps for witnessing to a Jehovah's Witness.

*"HOW TO WIN A JEHOVAH WITNESS (OR JEWISH PERSON) TO CHRIST WITH A KJV (an NIV won't work)*

1. Point him to Rev. 1:11 and read: "*I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last*":
2. Ask him, "*Who is the 'first and the last'?*" Who is speaking?

3. Every J.W. (or Jewish person even slightly versed in scripture) will say, “Jehovah,” based on Old Testament verses such as Isaiah 44:6 or 48:12 which say, “I am the **first**, and I am the **last**...” “**I am he**...”
4. Then point him to Rev. 1:18, “I am **he** that liveth, and was **dead**; and, behold, I am alive for evermore,”
5. Ask him, “When was Jehovah dead?”
6. They **then** realize that Jesus Christ was “God manifest in the flesh.” (1 Tim. 3:16)
7. This technique has been used to lead more J.W.’s to Christ than any other. It works every time I’ve done it.
8. Of course **NONE** of this is in an NIV **OR** a Jehovah Witness New World Translation!”

Dr Mrs Riplinger testifies unequivocally to having led Jehovah’s Witnesses to the Lord Jesus Christ using this approach with 100% success. James White cannot match this testimony – see above.

Concerning White’s modified chart of Carson’s, this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 305ff</sup> has addressed 6 of the verses. Literature references have been updated.

““The “High Christology” of the NIV”

“Our critic then insists that “In a number of instances the NIV is much clearer for the deity of Christ, and the deity and personality of the Holy Spirit than the KJV.”

“He seeks to illustrate this assertion by reference to “five key texts affirming the deity of Christ about which there is no textual controversy John 1:1; Romans 9:5; Titus 2:13; Hebs 1:8; 2 Peter 1:1. In terms of presenting a high Christology the NIV scores 5 out of 5 while the KJV scores 3 out of 5”...

“He then extends this list to eight, “where the Greek text can be understood (either in the light of the best Greek MSS. or correct grammatical interpretation) to call Christ God.”

“Observe that our critic does NOT specify WHICH mss. are “the best Greek mss.”, nor does he allow for the fact that INTERPRETATIONS belong to GOD, Genesis 40:8, not Greek grammarians.

“His eight verses are John 1:1, 1:18, Acts 20:28, Romans 9:5, 2 Thess. 1:12, Titus 2:13, Hebs. 1:8, 2 Peter 1:1. He concludes “The KJV accepts only 4 out of 8 as referring to Christ’s deity, while the NIV accepts 7 out of 8. Yet the NIV is supposed to be apostate!”

“Dr Ruckman<sup>33 p ii-iii, 346</sup> states “Between 1970 and 1984, several writers tried to bluster, blow, stick out their chicken breasts, and prove that such corruptions as the ASV, RV, NIV, NASV, RSV, and others did not attack the Deity of Christ. In order to do this, they deliberately side-stepped ALL of the salient verses that dealt with it (see Acts 4:27; 1 Tim. 3:16; Acts 20:28; Luke 2:33; Luke 23:42; John 3:13; et al.) and chose other verses that were NOT salient...John 1:1, which is not salient; John 1:18 (where (Custer<sup>57</sup>) had accepted the Arian teaching of the Jehovah’s Witnesses); Romans 9:5, which is not salient\*; Titus 2:13, which is not salient; and Hebrews 1:8, which is not salient.”

\*Dr Ruckman<sup>119 p 357</sup> has since stated, “[Romans 9:5] is one of the greatest verses in the Bible on the Deity of Jesus Christ.” However, the thrust of his statement, i.e. that modern versions do corrupt salient verses on the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ is unaltered and is vindicated by Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments – see above – and also by David Cloud’s ex-

tensive comments. See below, especially with respect to Romans 9:5. With the benefit of hindsight, i.e. access to Dr Ruckman's works published before his, James White has included 1 Timothy 3:16 in his modified Carson's list. He has also added John 20:28, Philippians 2:5, 6, Colossians 1:15-17, Colossians 2:9 and omitted 2 Thessalonians 1:12. This author's earlier work continues:

*"Although our critic's list of eight verses includes Acts 20:28, this is only possible because the NIV WENT BACK to the AV1611 reading from the RSV reading "of the Lord", which the NIV nevertheless RETAINED in the margin [i.e. footnote].*

*"Otherwise, our critic's list bears an uncanny resemblance to the verses cited by Dr Ruckman as "not salient" by comparison with the verses he lists which DO emphasise Christ's Deity.*

*"Once again, Gail Riplinger<sup>14 p 369-371</sup> reveals the subterfuge to which our critic has resorted. She refers to a book by "D. A. Carson, a most forward new version advocate" entitled The King James Version Debate.*

*"“(Carson) proceeds to give, as “advanced work,” a small chart from the promotional brochures used to ‘advance’ the sale of new versions. It quickly becomes apparent that he must mean - ‘advanced con artistry’ not ‘advanced’ scholarship. The chart is composed of only eight verses, which he calls, “all the verses of the New Testament that can be translated in such a way that they directly call Jesus, ‘God’.” (He must be using a new version.) In fact, only three of the eight deal with the deity of Christ at all. (Books such as Nave's Topical Bible or Lockyer's classic All the Doctrines of the Bible do not even mention these five other verses under the heading ‘Deity of Christ.’ However, these books do cite many of the verses covered in this book which are omitted by the new versions.)*

*““The following is an abridgement of the trumped-up chart used by new version publishers and Carson.*

**““VERSES THAT IDENTIFY JESUS AS GOD”**

<b>Verse</b>	<b>KJV</b>	<b>NIV</b>
John 1:1	Yes	Yes
John 1:18	No	Yes
John 20:28	Yes	Yes
Rom. 9:5	Yes	Yes
2 Thess. 1:12	No	No
Titus 2:13	No	Yes
Heb. 1:8	Yes	Yes
2 Pet. 1:1	No	Yes

*“For brevity, I have omitted the NASV, which is also included in the chart.*

*“Our critic's list has Acts 20:28 instead of John 20:28. The discrepancy is minor because the NIV reads as the AV1611 in Acts 20:28, while both versions are awarded a “Yes” by Carson for John 20:28. However, there is a slight advantage for Our critic in using Acts 20:28 because in John 20:28 the NIV reads “Thomas answered, “My Lord and my God!”*



*“The AV1611 reads **“And Thomas answered AND SAID UNTO HIM, My Lord and my God”** (my emphasis). The AV1611 puts much greater emphasis on the fact that Thomas is addressing Jesus. The NIV\* agrees with the JB. The RV, NWT, Ne and other Greek texts read with the AV1611.*

\*The current online version of the NIV reads *“Thomas said to him, “My Lord and my God!””* The change is a slight improvement but it is unclear whom Thomas is referring to. Only the AV1611 reading is unequivocal.

*“Gail Riplinger continues “The KJV’s four out of eight verses marked ‘No’, to which Carson points to support his claim that “the KJV missed half” of the verses on Christ’s deity, prove to be straw men which fall with a touch of scholarly inspection.*

1. *John 1:18<sup>14 p 339, 342</sup> The term **“the only begotten Son”** is seen in the vast majority of MSS and is witnessed to the earliest extant record of John 1:18, Tertullian in A.D. 150...The word **‘only begotten’** emphasises too strongly the distinction between Jesus Christ, the begotten Son, and believers who are adopted sons. **“Only begotten”** also flattens any New Age assertion that Jesus is one in a long line of avatars. The ‘censored’ versions stand ready to support those unscriptural schemers who subscribe to a Son who was not ‘begotten’.*

*“““He, Jesus, is the unique Son of God...but there have been lots of others like him...he was a guide and I can be just like him” New Ager.*

*“““The only Son, Jesus is mankind’s Saviour. The second advent of Jesus is in Korea” Reverend Moon.*

*“““The Spirit of Eternity is One...God the Mother is omniscient...The only Son is Christ, and Christ is Love” The Aquarian Gospel of Jesus Christ...*

*““The jarring tone of ‘Christians’ harmonising with cultists is confounding. (Recall that Palmer hand picked the members of the NIV committee and had the final say on all translations.)*

*“““The Holy Spirit did not beget the Son” Edwin Palmer NIV Committee Executive Secretary.”*

*“I will discuss John 1:18\* further in relation to Scriptures which our critic wishes to delete from the Bible. Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 370</sup> continues:*

\*White gives detailed and adverse comments on John 1:18 as found in the AV1611. These will be addressed below.

2. *2 Thessalonians 1:12: ALL versions read **“our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.”** The originator of the chart thinks a comma should be added (after **“God”**). (Author’s note: I believe that Dr Mrs. Riplinger means that the **“and”** in the clause should be replaced by a comma.)*
3. *Titus 2:13: ALL Greek texts have the wording of the KJV, **“God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”** None render it as the new versions do.*
4. *2 Peter 1:1 Lewis Foster, NIV and NKJV committee member, reveals WHY new version editors insert Christ’s deity in Peter and Titus, yet removed it (in) nearly 100 other places. “Some would point out that in passages Titus and 2 Peter, the expression of the deity of Christ has been strengthened by renderings even in liberal translations. What many do not realize is that even here the strong affirmation of deity is used to serve a purpose. The liberal translator ordinarily denies that Paul*

wrote Titus or that Peter wrote 2 Peter. He points to the very language deifying Jesus as an indication of the later date of these epistles when Paul and Peter could not have written them.”

5. 2 Thessalonians 1:12, Titus 2:13, and 2 Peter 1:1 are called “hendiades,” from the Greek “*hen, dia dyoin*,” ‘one by two’. Grammatically it is the “expression of an idea by two nouns connected by “and”, instead of by a noun and an adjunct. It would be like introducing one’s spouse as “my wife and best friend.””

“Dr. Ruckman<sup>33 p iii</sup> adds “Any fool could have seen the same construction in Isaiah 45:21.”

“The AV1611 reading in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 is actually a superior testimony to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ than the NIV variation. “Our God,” NIV, simply designates the Lord as God of the Christians\*. The expression “**God and our Saviour**”, AV1611, shows that the Lord is GOD universally but effectually the Saviour of the Christian. Doctrinally, the Lord is, of course, “**Saviour of the world**” John 4:42.”

\*Thus allowing for New Age flexibility, for other belief systems, e.g. Islam, Hinduism, Mariolatry etc., where other deities may be worshipped as ‘God.’

David Cloud<sup>6 Part 4</sup> responds in detail to White’s chart, his emphases. (He has an unwarranted criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger in his response but the remainder of his material is nevertheless most helpful.)

“**WHITE DENIES THAT THE MODERN VERSIONS WEAKEN THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST’S DEITY.**

“White dedicates an entire chapter, “The Son of God, the Lord of Glory,” to denying that the modern texts and versions weaken the doctrine of Christ’s deity. He concludes that not only do the critical Greek text and key modern versions NOT undermine the deity of Christ, but he makes the claim that the New International Version and the New American Standard Version are actually stronger in their witness to Christ’s deity than the King James Bible. White states, “Some KJV Only advocates are surprised to note that the KJV does not do as well as some modern versions when it comes to providing clear, understandable translations of the key, central passages in the New Testament that testify to the full deity of Jesus Christ” (White, p. 196). How can he make such a statement? Is he right? No, he has done what he charges “KJV Only” folk with doing. He has twisted the facts to fit his point.

“On page 197 he has a chart which compares passages on the deity of Christ in three versions (the KJV, NIV, NASV). He includes 12 passages - John 1:1; 1:18; 20:28; Acts 20:28; Romans 9:5; Philippians 2:5-6; Colossians 1:15-17; 2:9; 1 Timothy 3:16; Titus 2:13; Hebrews 1:8; 2 Peter 1:1. He claims that the NIV has a clear testimony to Christ’s deity in 11 of these and omits one, whereas the KJV has a clear testimony in only six, is ambiguous in five, and omits one...

**First, White errs in considering only part of the evidence.** There is no doubt that the 12 passages which White presents are SOME of the key passages on Christ’s deity (except, possibly for 2 Peter 1:1), **but many other important passages are completely ignored, so that the results of his comparison are grossly and wrongly skewed in favor of the NIV.** The following is a list of White’s passages with the addition of many others which should have been included. Those preceded by asterisks are weaker in the New International Version.

*“\*\*MICAH 5:2 - The NIV says Christ had an origin: “...out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times.” The KJV, on the other hand, supports Christ’s eternal Godhead with the translation: “...yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” On the basis of this one verse I would reject the NIV.”*

White<sup>3 p 214-216</sup> seeks to justify the NIV reading for Micah 5:2 later in this chapter. His remarks will be addressed subsequently. Cloud continues.

*“\*\*MATTHEW 8:2 - Eleven times in the Received Text and the King James Bible the Gospels tell us that Christ was worshipped (Mt. 2:11; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:20; 28:9,17; Mk. 5:6; Lk. 24:52; Jn. 9:38). This is indisputable evidence that Jesus Christ is God, because only God can be worshipped (Ex. 34:14; Is. 42:8; Mt. 4:10; Acts 14:11-15; Rev. 19:10). The NIV removes one-half of this unique witness to Christ’s deity, changing “worship” to “kneel before” in Mt. 8:2; 9:18; 15:25; 20:20; Mk. 5:6. In the Received Text the Greek word (proskuneo) is the same in all eleven verses. It is the key New Testament word for “worship.” It appears 58 times in the Greek New Testament and is always translated “worship” in the King James Bible. The modern version defender will argue that there is no serious problem here, because Christ is still worshipped in six of the verses. I don’t agree with this evaluation. In fact, I consider such an argument very strange indeed, because the man who truly loves the words of God cares about the details of the Bible and is concerned deeply about the omission of things. For many years I have noticed that defenders of the modern versions have a strange lackadaisical attitude toward the details of the Bible. As we have noted earlier, the repetition is in the Bible for a purpose. It is not inconsequential fluff.”*

See Cloud<sup>6 Part 3</sup> and remarks in **Chapter 3**. Cloud continues.

*“\*\*LUKE 2:33, 43 - By changing “Joseph” to “the child’s father” and “his parents,” the NIV weakens the testimony of Christ’s virgin birth somewhat, compared with the reading of the KJV and the Received Text. While it is true that the NIV plainly says that Christ was virgin born (Mt. 1:18-20), the KJV backs up that testimony with the added witness of Lk. 2:33, 43, whereas the NIV does not.”*

White<sup>3 p 216, 218</sup> tries to justify the NIV’s heretical reading for Luke 2:33 later in this chapter, where his comments will be addressed. Cloud continues.

*“\*\*JOHN 1:27 - By removing the phrase “is preferred before me,” the NIV weakens this wonderful testimony to the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. Evangelist Chuck Salliby notes: “Each little expression such as ‘is preferred before me,’ like so many pieces in a puzzle, was designed to make its own contribution to the completed picture of Christ on the Bible page - His Person, works, character, incomparableness, etc. Yet, they are systematically left out wherever possible in the NIV. This is indeed a strange practice. While a secular book generally exaggerates the depiction of its main character, the NIV depreciates that of its own” (Salliby, *If the Foundations Be Destroyed*, p. 21)...*

*“\*\*JOHN 3:13 - The King James Version witnesses to the Godhead and omnipresence of the Lord Jesus Christ in this verse, but the NIV, in deleting the crucial phrase “which is in heaven,” destroys this witness. At least 99.5% of all Greek manuscript evidence contains the phrase in question. Only two papyri, four uncials (particularly the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus), and one cursive manuscript omit it...*

*“\*\*JOHN 6:69 - The KJV, following the Received Text, contains in this verse one of the most precious testimonies to the Deity of Christ. This testimony is emasculated in the NIV.*

*JN. 6:69 KJV: “And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.”*

*JN. 6:69 NIV: “We believe and know that you are the Holy One of God.”*

*\*\*JOHN 9:35 - The KJV witnesses to Christ’s deity in this verse, but the NIV, following the critical Greek text, does not.*

*JN. 9:35 KJV: “ ...Doest thou believe on the Son of God?”*

*JN. 9:35 NIV: “ ...Do you believe in the Son of Man?””*

White<sup>3 p 260-1</sup> tries to justify the omission of **“which is in heaven”** from John 3:13 by appealing to the scholarship of Dr Bruce Metzger. See **Chapter 7** for a summary of Cloud’s researches<sup>6 Part 2</sup> on Bruce Metzger. White’s comments on John 3:13 will be dealt with subsequently. White<sup>3 210-211, 262-3</sup> also tries to justify the NIV reading for John 9:35 and his comments will be addressed subsequently. Cloud continues.

*“\*\*ACTS 3:13 - The KJV exalts Christ as the Son of God in this verse, whereas the NIV, following a different text, makes him a servant. Christ is called the Son of God or God’s Son 126 times in the New Testament, whereas he is called “servant” (in the KJV) only once, and that is in Matt. 12:18, which is a quotation of Isaiah 42:1...*

*“\*\*ROMANS 9:5 - The NIV is sound in its witness to Christ in the text, but it undermines the text with a footnote which reads: “or, ‘Christ who is over all, God be forever praised.’” Bible scholar/translator Jay Green, Sr., notes: “The NIV footnote is a gloss preferred by those who do not believe that Christ is co-equal with God in essence and attributes. When the Revised Version (1881) inserted it, Burgon quoted 60 patristic fathers as using this verse to prove the Godhood of Christ. And the Unitarians have stated that the only two verses that needed to be changed to destroy the doctrine of the Trinity are Romans 9:5 and 1 Tim. 3:16” (Green, The Gnostics, p. 51). James White claims that the King James Version is ambiguous in this verse, but the KJV follows the Greek almost word for word and gives an accurate and clear translation in English. The verse does not say that Christ is blessed of God forever; it says He is GOD blessed for ever. It is one of the most powerful statements to the Godhood of Christ in the Bible, and it is plain for anyone who has ears to hear. As noted, 19<sup>th</sup>-century Unitarians who were on the Bible translation committees for the Revised Version (1881) and the American Standard Version (1901) understood this and they did not like the KJV translation as a result. Godly English commentators of generations past had no problem with this verse as it stands in the King James Version. Matthew Henry (1662-1714) is an example. He saw this verse in the KJV as “a very full proof of the Godhead of Christ; he is not only over all, as Mediator, but he is God blessed for ever.” We do not accept White’s charge that the KJV is weak here in regard to Christ’s deity. Every passage must be interpreted in the context of the wider testimony of Scripture, and when we do so with the KJV in Romans 9:5 we see that Christ is both God and that He is blessed of God. That is exactly what the rest of the Bible says! It speaks of the mystery of the Trinity.*

*ROM. 9:5 KJV: “Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.”*

*ROM. 9:5 NIV: “Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, who is God over all, forever praised! Amen.””*

Note that the AV1611 reading for Romans 9:5 matches John 5:22, ***“For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.”*** The NIV obscures the cross reference. Cloud continues.

*“\*\*1 CORINTHIANS 15:47 - By omitting the words “the Lord,” the NIV, following the critical text, obliterates a powerful reference to Christ’s deity, whereas the Received Text and the King James Version give a unique and unequivocal testimony that Jesus Christ is God...*

*“\*\*EPHESIANS 3:9 - The KJV in this verse exalts Jesus Christ as the Creator of all things, whereas the NIV, by removing the crucial phrase “by Jesus Christ,” obliterates this witness entirely...”*

See **Chapters 4** and **7** for refutation of White’s comments on Ephesians 3:9. Cloud continues.

*“\*\*PHILIPPIANS 2:6-7 - The KJV is stronger in its witness to Christ’s deity and much clearer in every way because of its careful and literal translation of the Greek. The NIV says Christ was in very nature God but clouds the testimony by its wording that Christ “did not consider equality with God something to be grasped” and that he “made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant.” The NIV in this passage leaves Christ’s Godhead during his incarnation in doubt, whereas the KJV does not. The age-long theological battles pertaining to the Deity of Christ are very complex and involve many facets of Christ’s preexistence, nature, earthly character, and future status. The Gnostics were willing for Christ to be a god and creator, but not the very God. Origen, for example, accepted that Jesus was deity but not that He was co-equal in the Trinity with the Father. He wrote, “Christ is inferior to the Father who is the God. The Son is divine in a derivative sense, for he gains his deity by communication from the Father, the only true God, who is preeminent as the single source or foundation of deity” (quoted from Jay Green, *The Gnostics, the New Versions, and the Deity of Christ*, p. 1). The Jehovah’s Witnesses admit that Jesus is the Son of God and “a” God, but not Jehovah God. The Unitarians admit that Jesus was “divine” but not that He was Almighty God. The Mormons admit that Jesus is a god, but not that He is Jehovah God or that He and the Father God are one. Others admit that Christ is God but not that He was eternally the Son of God. Still others acknowledge that Christ was God in eternity past but that He laid aside His deity in His incarnation. This is a view which is allowed by the rendering of Phil. 2:6, 7 in the NIV.*

*“Only an accurate translation of the preserved Text can secure the doctrinal victory in these fierce and complex theological battles so that God’s people have a proper understanding of the Person of Jesus Christ. I repeat, no English translation is more Christ-honoring than the King James Version.*

*PHIL. 2:6, 7 KJV: “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”*

*PHIL. 2:6, 7 NIV: “Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.”*

*“\*\*COLOSSIANS 2:9 - The term Godhead in the KJV is more powerful and effective than the NIV’s rendering of “deity.” Jay Green wisely notes: “While the lexicons give both*

*deity and Godhead as the meaning of this Greek word (theothtos), keep in mind that there are many deities in this world, but only one true Godhead, which identifies Christ as being one in essence with God the Father and God the Holy Spirit” (Green, The Gnostics, p. 37).*

*COL. 2:9 KJV: “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.”*

*COL. 2:9 NIV: “For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form.”*

*“\*\*1 TIMOTHY 3:16 - In this verse the KJV, following the Received Text, gives probably the clearest reference in the entire Bible that Jesus Christ is God. The NIV, following the critical Greek text, omits the word “God,” rendering the verse almost meaningless.”*

See extensive commentary in **Chapter 4**. Cloud continues.

*“\*\*1 TIMOTHY 6:14-16 - The KJV in this passage is unequivocal in its testimony that Jesus Christ is God. The NIV, though, by adding the word “God” to verse 15, creates doubt about whether or not this doxology refers directly to Christ.*

*1 TIM. 6:14-16 KJV: “That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.”*

*1 TIM. 6:14-16 NIV: “to keep this commandment without spot or blame until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which God will bring about in his own time - God, the blessed and only Ruler, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who alone is immortal and who lives in unapproachable light, whom no one has seen or can see. To him be honor and might forever. Amen.”*

*“\*\*HEBREWS 1:3 - The KJV is stronger in its witness to Christ in this verse. Jay Green, Sr., Editor and Translator of the Interlinear Bible, notes the important difference between the KJV and the NIV in this passage: “The new versions present the Son as a replica of God, not co-equal with God, not one in essence with God the Father and God the Spirit, but only a copy, a representation, an imprint, a stamp...”*

*HEB. 1:3 KJV: “Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.”*

*HEB. 1:3 NIV: “The Son is the radiance of God’s glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven.”*

*“\*\*HEBREWS 1:8 - The KJV clearly presents Christ as the eternal God in this verse. The NIV, though, by saying Christ’s throne “will last forever,” instead of “is forever,” leaves room for the false doctrine that Christ had a beginning. When combined with the NIV’s perverted rendering of Micah 5:2, it teaches this very heresy.*

*HEB. 1:8 KJV: "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom."*

*HEB. 1:8 NIV: "But about the Son he says, 'Your throne, O God, will last forever and ever, and righteousness will be the scepter of your kingdom.'"*

White insists that Hebrews 1:8 in the NIV is "clear" with respect to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Cloud's comparison reveals that White is lying, again. Cloud continues.

*"\*\*1 JOHN 3:16 - By replacing "God" with "Christ," the NIV removes this powerful reference to Christ's Godhead.*

*1 JOHN 3:16 KJV: "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."*

*1 JOHN 3:16 NIV: "This is how we know what love is: Jesus Christ laid down his life for us. And we ought to lay down our lives for our brothers."*

*"\*\*1 JOHN 4:3 - By removing the phrase "Christ is come in the flesh" from verse 3, the NIV weakens the testimony of this passage as compared with the KJV and allows room for the ecumenical philosophy that says everyone who "loves Jesus" is of God. False spirits will "acknowledge Jesus," but the Jesus they acknowledge is a false Jesus (2 Cor. 11:3). One can argue that since the NIV has the phrase "confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" in verse 2 and omits the phrase only in verse 3, there is no significant problem. I am sure James White would say this [he does<sup>3 p 184-5</sup>], but my reply is that we are comparing the KJV with the NIV in key passages touching on Christ's deity to see which translation is stronger overall, and there is no doubt that the NIV in this passage is somewhat weaker than the KJV.*

*1 JN. 4:2-3 KJV: "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."*

*1 JN. 4:3 NIV: "This is how you can recognize the Spirit of God: Every spirit that acknowledges that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God, but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you have heard is coming and even now is already in the world."*

*"\*\*1 JOHN 5:7 - This verse in the KJV is a powerful witness to the Deity of Jesus Christ as an equal member of the Godhead. The NIV, though, omits the verse and has no witness whatsoever. We are taking a simple survey through the New Testament to see which of the English translations is more honoring to Jesus Christ, the KJV or the NIV, and the KJV is winning hands down.*

*1 JN. 5:7 KJV: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."*

*1 JN. 5:7 NIV: Omitted*

*"\*\*REVELATION 1:11 - By removing "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last" from verse 11, the NIV, following the critical Greek text, seriously weakens this powerful reference to Christ's Godhead. As it stands in the Received Text and the KJV and any other faithful TR translation, the Almighty of verse 8 is obviously the Lord Jesus Christ of verse 11. Modern version proponents like to point out the fact that the critical text adds*

*the word “God” in verse 8. But consider the whole picture: Verse 8 in the critical text omits “the beginning and the ending.” Verse 9 omits “Christ” two times. Verse 11 omits “I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.” The overall effect of the modern version rendering of Revelation chapter one is to weaken its testimony to Christ’s deity as compared with the King James Bible.*

*REV. 1:11 KJV: “Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.”*

*REV. 1:11 NIV: “which said: ‘Write on a scroll what you see and send it to the seven churches: to Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea.’”*

See **Chapter 4** for detailed discussion of 1 John 5:7 and **Chapter 7** for extended comments on 1 John 4:2, 3 and Revelation 1:11. Against White’s 12 passages for comparison between the AV1611 and the modern versions with respect to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, of which only 6 are supposedly superior to the AV1611 in the NIV; John 1:18, Romans 9:5, Philippians 2:5, 6, Colossians 2:9, Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1 and one is superior in the AV1611; 1 Timothy 3:16, Cloud has cited over 20 passages where the AV1611 is superior to the NIV with respect to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. These passages include Romans 9:5, Philippians 2:5-7, Colossians 2:9, where Cloud has shown that White is lying with respect to the NIV’s alleged ‘superiority.’ As indicated with respect to Micah 5:2, Luke 2:33, John 3:13, 9:35 – see above - John 1:18, Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1 will be addressed in more detail when they are encountered in White’s book<sup>3</sup> p 198-200, 258-260, 201-267-270

Cloud’s discussion includes verses in addition to those listed above, where in his view, both the AV1611 and the modern versions are clear with respect to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Note that these additional verses include Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. As indicated, these verses will be addressed later but for now, see remarks above with respect to the inferior readings in the modern versions for these verses, from this author’s earlier work.

Nevertheless, Cloud’s conclusion with respect to his first point is valid, as follows.

*“CONCLUSION: Twenty-four out of the above 44 key passages on the deity of Christ are weakened in the NIV. That means that more than one-half of the key testimonies are weakened or removed in the New International Version. Not one of these testimonies [is] omitted from the KJV; and, in our estimation, not one of these passages in the KJV is weak in its testimony to the Deity of Jesus Christ. By taking into consideration a wider range of passages touching on the Deity of Christ, a much different picture is given from that which appears in James White’s book.”*

As Cloud indicates, White has cunningly spread the weaker modern readings on the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ across three chapters of his book, Chapters 4, 7, 8 and relegated some of them to his Part Two, in order to bolster the results of his bogus modified-Carson chart in favour of the NIV, NASV. Ezekiel 22:13, 27 describes this kind of subterfuge as *“dishonest gain.”*

If left unchecked, it will *“destroy souls.”*



Cloud's second point against White's modified-Carson chart is, Cloud's emphases, that White ***“errs in overstating and twisting that part of the evidence that he does consider. For example, he claims the KJV is ambiguous in four key passages - Rom. 9:5; Col. 2:9; Tit. 2:13; and 2 Pet. 1:1. Having examined the passages carefully, we believe he is misstating the case in all four instances.”***

As indicated, Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 will be considered later. Cloud has provided sufficient evidence to show that the AV1611 is *not* ambiguous in Romans 9:5, Colossians 2:9. Cloud continues, his emphases.

***“Third, White errs in claiming that the vast omissions pertaining to the name of the Lord Jesus Christ does nothing to weaken the doctrine of His deity. One of the characteristics of the critical Greek text and the modern versions which follow it is the widespread omission of names and titles belonging to the Lord Jesus Christ. The aforementioned Everett Fowler spent many years diligently comparing the Received Text with the Westcott-Hort Greek text, the Nestle Greek Text, and the Bible Societies' Greek Text, and several popular modern English versions. In 1976 Fowler obtained the Trinitarian Bible Society edition of the Received Text, and he began his comparisons. Eventually he published his findings in the book Evaluating Versions of the New Testament<sup>60</sup>. One section of this excellent work lists “Omissions of Names of Our Lord God.” The omissions affect the reading of 101 verses. There are 221 omissions of the various names of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Westcott-Hort text, 230 in the Nestle's text, 212 in the Bible Societies text. The modern English versions follow this pattern. The American Standard Version of 1901 has 198 of these omissions of the names and titles of the Lord Jesus Christ and the New American Standard Version of 1973 has 210 omissions.***

*“Many men of God believe the Westcott-Hort text and the modern translations weaken the Scriptures' testimony of the deity of Jesus Christ through this barrage of significant omissions pertaining to His name and title. The flippant dismissal of this as insignificant by James White and other modern version defenders is strange [abominable].*

***“Fourth, White errs in failing to acknowledge exactly what King James Bible defenders say about the witness of the modern versions to Christ's deity and some other key doctrines. As noted earlier, King James Bible defenders do not claim that the modern versions OMIT key doctrines. They claim that the modern versions WEAKEN some of them through a barrage of often relatively minor (in themselves) changes and omissions. I have studied the Bible in various versions for a quarter of a century, and I am convinced that this charge is accurate. (I was prejudiced AGAINST the King James Bible in my early years, and only through prayerful study did I become convinced that the Received Text and the King James Bible were the preserved Word of God.) I have attempted to defend the doctrine of Christ's Godhead many times through various modern versions which were possessed by people with whom I was dealing. This has happened frequently in the county jail ministry, for example, during the past six years. From time to time someone will attend our Bible studies who has a Jehovah's Witness or some other background which undermines Christ's deity. They often have a modern version, and in my experience it is easier to defend their perverted doctrine from the modern versions than it is from the King James Bible. It is no accident that the Jehovah's Witnesses choose to publish the Westcott-Hort Greek text. They, and their Unitarian friends who also deny Christ's Godhead, understand that which White claims is not true: that the modern critical text provides the best support for doctrinal heresy.***

***“Fifth, in regard to the issue of whether or not the modern critical Greek text weakens the doctrine of Christ, White errs in ignoring the testimony of 19th-century Bible de-***

*fenders.* A large number of men of God in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, who fought against the critical Greek texts which were then being introduced, saw in them an attack upon the deity of Christ. I have documented this in my book *For Love of the Bible: The Battle for the Received Text and the King James Bible from 1800 to Present*. I believe this is a very significant point, and it is one which James White completely ignores, because he persists in his delusion that this issue is one which has been raised solely by some “King James Only” cult of recent decades. Consider a couple of examples of the many which could be given.

“The first example is **Frederick Nolan** (1784-1864). In 1815 he published *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*, subtitled “in which the Greek manuscripts are newly classed, the integrity of the Authorised Text vindicated, and the various readings traced to their origin.” As the title suggests, this 576-page volume was a defense of the text underlying the Authorized Version. Nolan said, “...it shall be my object to vindicate those important passages of the Received Text which have been rejected from the Scripture Canon, on the principles of the German method of classification” (p. 43). Among the several passages that he thus vindicated are 1 Timothy 3:16 and 1 John 5:7.

“Nolan defended the sixteenth-century text on the basis of faith and theological purity. In particular, Nolan was defending the TR against the text and theorizing of J. Griesbach. Nolan saw the hand of God guiding the sixteenth-century textual editors, and he understood that the Received Text is theologically superior to the critical texts. In a careful and very technical manner this Bible scholar traced the history of the doctrinal corruptions which were introduced into the text of various manuscripts during the first four centuries after Christ. Of course, James White and his modern version defender friends pretend that such a view is the delusion of late 20th-century King James Only cultists. Nolan would be amazed.

“**“The works of those early writers lie under the positive imputation of being corrupted.** The copies of Clement and Origen were corrupted in their life time; the manuscripts from which Tertullian’s works have been printed are notoriously faulty; and the copies of Cyprian demonstrate their own corruption, by their disagreement among themselves, and their agreement with different texts and revisals of Scripture. It is likewise indisputable, that these fathers not only followed each other, adopting the arguments and quotations of one another; but that **they quoted from the heterodox as well as the orthodox.** They were thus likely to transmit from one to another erroneous quotations, originally adopted from sources not more pure than heretical revisals of Scripture. ... New revisals of Scripture were thus formed, which were interpolated with the peculiar readings of scholiasts and fathers. Nor did this systematic corruption terminate here; but when new texts were thus formed, they became the standard by which the later copies of the early writers were in succession corrected” (*An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, 1815, pp. 326-332).

“Nolan connects this textual corruption with manuscripts such as the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus which contain readings at variance with the Received Text. In his *Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, Nolan detailed the overwhelming textual authority which supports various key passages which were in the Received Text but which are disputed by the modern versions.

*“The amazing thing is that these facts, which were understood by the Reformation editors and confirmed by wise scholars in the nineteenth century, are scoffed today, even by many supposed Evangelical and some Fundamentalist scholars. James White is only one example. Why? BECAUSE THESE EVANGELICALS AND FUNDAMENTALISTS ARE NOT DEPENDING ON THEIR OWN SCHOLARSHIP BUT UPON THE RATIONALISTIC SCHOLARSHIP OF THE PAST TWO CENTURIES.*

*“Robert Lewis Dabney (1820-98) is another example of those who were opposing the theories of modern textual criticism in the United States a century and more ago. We gave an overview of Dabney’s life and ministry earlier in this study<sup>6</sup> Parts 2, 3. He boldly withstood the apostasy which was creeping in on every side in this day. His biographer called him “a soldier until death, at war with much in his age.” We can say amen and praise the Lord to that attitude!*

*“Dabney understood the theological corruption of the critical text, and he traced these corruptions to second- and third-century heretics. He understood that scholarship is not synonymous with wisdom and spiritual discernment. He knew the fickleness of modern scholarship. He knew that the modern theories of textual criticism are founded upon conjecture and rationalism, not absolute truth and biblical faith. We do not agree with all of Dabney’s conclusions on textual matters, but the fact remains that his analysis of modern textual criticism is devastating and it definitely was contrary to that of James White. It is crucial to understand that the modern English versions are translated from a Greek text which is built upon discredited theories. Consider an excerpt from one of his articles on this subject which noted the doctrinal nature of the textual battle:*

*The following list [of doctrinal corruptions in the critical Greek text] is not presented as complete, but as containing the most notable of these points. ... the Sinai and the Vatican MSS. concur in omitting, in Matthew vi. 13, the closing doxology of our Lord’s prayer. In John viii. 1-11, they and the Alexandrine omit the whole narrative of Christ’s interview with the woman taken in adultery and her accusers. The first two omit the whole of Mark xvi., from the ninth verse to the end. Acts viii. 37, in which Philip is represented as propounding to the eunuch faith as the qualification for baptism, is omitted by all three.*

*... in Acts ix. 5, 6 ... the Sinai, Vatican and Alexandrine MSS. all concur in [omitting ‘Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said...’ from the passage.]*

*In 1 Tim. iii. 16 ... the Sinai, Codex Ephremi, and probably the Alexandrine [omit God]...*

*In 1 John v. 7 ... all the old MSS. concur in omitting the heavenly witnesses...*

*In Jude 4 ... the MSS. omit God.*

*In Rev. i. 11 ... all three MSS. under remark concur in omitting the Messiah’s eternal titles...*

***If now the reader will glance back upon this latter list of variations, HE WILL FIND THAT IN EVERY CASE, THE DOCTRINAL EFFECT OF THE DEPARTURE FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT IS TO OBSCURE OR SUPPRESS SOME TESTIMONY FOR THE DIVINITY OF THE SAVIOUR....***

***The significant fact to which we wish especially to call attention is this: that all the variations proposed on the faith of these manuscripts which have any***

*doctrinal importance, should attack the one doctrine of the Trinity; nay, we may say even more specifically, the one doctrine of Christ's deity. ... Their admirers [of the favored manuscripts supporting the critical text] claim for them an origin in the fourth or fifth century. The Sabellian and Arian controversies raged in the third and fourth. Is there no coincidence here? Things do not happen again and again regularly without a cause. ... And when we remember the date of the great Trinitarian contest, and compare it with the supposed date of these exemplars of the sacred text, the ground of suspicion becomes violent. ... THESE VARIATIONS ARE TOO NUMEROUS, AND TOO SIGNIFICANT IN THEIR EFFECT UPON THE ONE DOCTRINE, TO BE ASCRIBED TO CHANCE. ... there are strong probable grounds to conclude, that the text of the Scriptures current in the East received a mischievous modification at the hands of the famous **ORIGEN**, which has not been usually appreciated. ... He is described by Mosheim ... as 'a compound of contraries, wise and unwise, acute and stupid, judicious and injudicious; the enemy of superstition, and its patron; a strenuous defender of Christianity, and its corrupter; energetic and irresolute; one to whom the Bible owes much, and from whom it has suffered much.' ... HIS REPUTATION AS THE GREAT INTRODUCER OF MYSTICISM, ALLEGORY, AND NEO-PLATONISM INTO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, IS TOO WELL KNOWN TO NEED RECITAL. Those who are best acquainted with the history of Christian opinion know best, that Origen was the great corrupter, and the source, or at least earliest channel, of nearly all the speculative errors which plagued the church in after ages. ... HE WAS STRICTLY A RATIONALIST. ... HE DISBELIEVED THE FULL INSPIRATION AND INFALLIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES, holding that the inspired men apprehended and stated many things obscurely. ... THE KEY-NOTE OF ALL ORIGEN'S LABORS WAS THE EFFORT TO RECONCILE CHRISTIANITY AND THIS ECLECTIC PAGAN PHILOSOPHY INTO A SUBSTANTIAL UNITY....*

*... SOMEBODY HAS PLAYED THE KNAVE WITH THE TEXT ... We think that [the reader] will conclude with us that the weight of probability is greatly in favour of this theory - that the anti-Trinitarians, finding certain codices in which these doctrinal readings had been already lost through the licentious criticism of Origen and his school, industriously diffused them, while they also did what they dared to add to the omissions of similar readings (R. L. Dabney, "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," Southern Presbyterian Review, April 1871, reprinted in Discussions Evangelical and Theological, 1890, pp. 350-389 ).*

*"We see that Robert Dabney, upon examining the same textual changes which later appeared in the Westcott-Hort Greek text of 1881 and which appear in the modern English versions today, concluded that they were deliberate and damnable doctrinal corruptions. We think Dabney would be amazed to hear James White say that this conclusion is the product of the feverish imagination of an allegedly anti-intellectual fundamental Baptist "King James Only" crowd which has arisen only in recent years! As we have seen, this is nonsense. For those who want to know the truth of the matter, we have offered a list of recommended resources at the end of this article."*

Cloud next ("*sixth*") alludes to a large number of modern versions that perpetuate the heretical readings of critical Greek texts that Nolan and Dabney highlighted. His final re-

marks on White's attempt to 'prove' that the modern versions are trustworthy with respect to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ are as follows.

***“Seventh, White errs in claiming that heretics who corrupt Bibles would always corrupt every key doctrinal passage. He says, “If there was an effort on the part of modern translations like the NIV or NASB to downplay the deity of Christ ... [s]uch a bias would be exhibited throughout a translation, and such is simply not the case” (White, p. 197). This is a false statement. Heretics do not necessarily attempt to corrupt every single passage, and to demonstrate this I will not go back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries. I can demonstrate this with a modern example, the Today's English Version (TEV). As demonstrated in the previous study, the TEV weakens the doctrine of the deity of Christ in many key passages - but not in every one of them. There are passages even in the Today's English Version which teach Christ's deity. This is interesting because its key translator, Robert Bratcher, denied that Jesus Christ is God. As early as 1953, Bratcher, then a Southern Baptist missionary in Brazil, Bratcher stated the following: “Jesus Christ would not enjoy omniscience. That is an attribute of God ... Jesus did not claim He and the Father to be one - which would be absurd” (Bratcher, O Jornal Batista [The Baptist Journal], July 9, 1953). In a letter to Julius C. Taylor, July 16, 1970, Bratcher confirmed what he wrote in 1953. Bratcher also denies the blood atonement of Jesus Christ and believes that the claim that the Bible is inerrant and infallible is “wilful ignorance or intellectual dishonesty” (Bratcher, Baptist Courier, April 2, 1981, reporting on Bratcher's speech to the Southern Baptist Life Commission in Dallas, Texas). Bratcher began working with the American Bible Society (ABS) in 1957 and was the chief translator for the Today's English Version, which was completed in 1976. After his public comments in 1981, the American Bible Society came under widespread attack and began losing support. Bratcher was therefore forced to resign from the ABS, but it was a mere shell game to deceive ABS supporters. Bratcher was hired by the United Bible Societies (UBS), and the American Bible Society continues to help pay his salary through its massive grants to the UBS; the Southern Baptists, in turn, continue to help fund Bratcher's work through the large SBC grants to the American Bible Society!***

*“In spite of the fact that its chief translator denies the Godhead of Jesus Christ, the Today's English Version does not COMPLETELY remove the deity of Christ; it merely weakens it. That is precisely what the critical Greek text does and all of the modern versions which follow that text.*

***“IN CONCLUSION, WHAT IS THE FRUIT OF WHITE'S APPROACH?”***

*“James White does an excellent job of tearing down faith in the Authorized Version and the Received Text, but what does he offer in its place? If I accept White's position, (1) I am dependent on modern scholarship to determine for me the correct text. (2) I am left without an established biblical authority. White makes light of this type of viewpoint, but he can make light all he wants, as far as I am concerned. I don't believe at this point in history that we are still groping around searching for the preserved Word of God. I believe the preservation of Scripture was progressive to a certain extent, just as the revelation of Scripture was progressive. There were the long centuries we call the dark ages and the middle ages, during which the Roman Catholic Church held sway over the civilized world. During those centuries, the history of the Bible was clouded by horrible and continuous persecution. Multitudes of Bibles and Scripture portions were destroyed by Rome. The literary records of entire groups of separated Christians were wiped from the face of the earth. We will not know the details of the transmission of the Scripture during those centuries until we get to Glory and can search Heaven's libraries, although we do*

*know that many Scriptures were used during those centuries which were similar to the Received Text. The history of the transmission of the biblical text does not become perfectly clear until the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries. Since then we can trace the history quite plainly, because we have the necessary records. We certainly see a progression in the history of the English Bible. From 1380 or 82, when the first English Bible was published, until 1611, the English Bible was in a state of transition and perfecting. From that point until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, only minor changes were made in the English Bible, largely spelling and grammatical changes. We believe we can see the hand of God in all of this. The perfecting period was over, and the distribution period had begun. During the centuries following the publication of the Authorized Version, the English Bible was distributed to the four corners of the world and wielded an influence among nations which has never been equalled. Many books have been written to document this phenomenon.*

*“What fruit does White’s approach produce in his readers’ minds? - questions, doubt, uncertainty, confusion. He will not agree with this assessment, I am certain, but I believe this is precisely the fruit of his approach to this issue. I saw it in my own life, when I briefly entertained the modern version position years ago.*

*“On the other hand, what is the fruit of the approach which accepts the Received Text as the preserved Word of God and the AV and other excellent Reformation translations as accurate translations thereof? The fruit of such an approach is faith, confidence, a settled text, an ability to preach and teach dogmatically. That is the fruit I have experienced in reading men like Edward F. Hills and D. O. Fuller. This is the fruit of my own writings on the subject of Bible texts and versions. I am willing to stand before the Lord and to give account for causing my readers to have confidence in the Authorized Version and in the textual family that it represents. I would not want, though, to stand before Him and to give account for causing people to have doubt and uncertainty and confusion, and for leaving them without a settled biblical standard in these last days.*

*“Edward F. Hills put it well when he stated that the modern critical approach gives maximum uncertainty, while the Received Text approach gives maximum certainty. No position can answer every question. No position can deal conclusively with every problem. But one position leaves one adrift upon the unsettled waters of modern textual scholarship, and the other position leaves one with a dependable Bible. That might be too simple and practical for some men, but I like it just fine!*

*“May God richly encourage you and bless you with confidence in His Preserved Scriptures in these troubled times, my friend. We need to be about the Father’s business while it is day.”*

White accuses Waite of not producing any evidence of Gnostic corruption of biblical manuscripts. Cloud has produced the necessary evidence, through the researches of Nolan and Dabney. White’s ‘evidence,’ by contrast, of ‘expansions of piety’ and scribal alterations – see below with respect to John 1:18, for example – consist of mere speculation. White’s criticisms of Waite, Green and others in this respect are, once again, at best an example of ‘pots and kettles.’

White<sup>3</sup> p 199-200, 258 says of John 1:18, *“The NASB translation [reads] “No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him,” the NIV reads, “No-one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father’s side, has made him known”...John 1:18 is one of the clearest, strongest affirmations of the deity of Christ.*

*“Yet we see that the KJV does not contain this reference to the deity of Christ. The difference between the AV and the modern translations is easily discerned, for here again we face a textual, rather than a translational difference...the most ancient texts, including the oldest existing copies of the book of John, P66 and P75, as well as a number of the early fathers of the church, refer to Christ as the “only-begotten God,” or more accurately, the “unique God.””*

Citing Donald Waite<sup>23 p 168</sup>, who declares, rightly, his emphasis, that the change from “**Son**” in John 1:18 to “**God**” as found in  $\aleph$  and B “*is pure HERESEY!*” and a “*Gnostic error,*” White complains that, his emphasis, “*Waite assumes a particular theological position, and on that basis rejects the reading “God”...There is no discussion of the understanding of the passage that was presented above [White’s<sup>3 p 198-9</sup> two-page justification of his “particular theological position,” not reproduced here because it matches that of ‘our critic’s<sup>8 p 331ff</sup> – see below]; there is no evidence given that Gnostics had anything to do with “changing” the reading at John 1:18; and there is no discussion of the actual meaning of the term “only-begotten” or “unique.” Instead, the KJV is assumed to be the standard...We should truly be concerned when maintaining allegiance to a **translation** causes us to weaken the case for a central doctrine of the faith, and this is exactly what we find here in the KJV Only camp.*”

White’s criticism of Waite is yet another instance of ‘pots and kettles.’ White has *ten standards*<sup>1 p 24-6</sup> and not one of them is a *bible*. Moreover, additional evidence of Gnostic corruption of John 1:18 will be given and “*discussion of the actual meaning of the term “only-begotten”*” will follow.

White enlarges on “*the most ancient texts*” as follows, his emphasis. He cites Jay P. Green, *Unholy Hands on the Bible, An Introduction to Textual Criticism*, p 12 as stating, “**“EXAMPLES OF HOW THE ‘BEST’ MSS. ROB CHRIST OF GLORY.”**

*““ $\aleph$  in John 1:18 refers to Christ as the “only-begotten God”...it is a Gnostic twist given to the Bible by the heretic Valentinus and his followers, who did not regard the Word and Christ as one and the same, who thought of the Son of God and the Father as being one and the same Person. Therefore, they determined to do away with “the only begotten Son” in order to accommodate their religion.”*

*“Mr Green’s reaction is based upon his understanding of theology, not upon the external evidence of the text. And while it is true that heretics down through the ages have appealed to this text, or that we must not allow the misuse of biblical texts to determine the readings we choose for the text of Scripture.”*

*“The readings WE choose”? Who is “we” and how did “we” come to take precedence over compilation of “the text of Scripture” according to Jeremiah 30:2?*

***“Thus speaketh the LORD God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book”?***

White does not address this question and he ignores Green’s explicit reference to the heretic Valentinus, which is surely part of “*the external evidence of the text.*”

However, White continues.

*“We find five variant readings in the manuscript tradition at this point, two of which have obviously given rise to the others. Here is the textual evidence given by the UBS 4<sup>th</sup> edition text.”*

Listing several sources for the modern reading including P66, P75,  $\aleph$ , B, C, L, 33, the Peshitta Syriac and Fathers; Origen, Didymus, Cyril, Clement, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Gregory-Nyssa, Serapion, White concludes that, *“the reading “only-begotten God” or more properly, “unique God,” is found in the two oldest manuscripts, P66 and P75, as well as in both  $\aleph$  and B. Given the great antiquity of these manuscripts and the correlation with the great uncials, this reading bears great weight...The survey of the Fathers also shows the wide-spread nature of this reading, and the fact that such notably orthodox men as Gregory, the bishop of Nyssa, a staunch defender of the doctrine of the Trinity, knew this reading and found no objection to it; rather he utilized it often in his writings as evidence of the glory of Christ.”*

White is, however, forced to admit that, *“The evidence for the reading [“the only begotten Son”] is very great indeed. It is, obviously, the majority reading of both the manuscripts, the translations, and the Fathers...”*

Nevertheless, he has an ‘explanation’ to dispose of the overwhelming body of evidence in favour of the AV1611 reading *“the only begotten Son.”*

*“It is difficult to see how the reading  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  [God] could arise from  $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$  [Son]. The terms are simply too far removed from one another in form to account for scribal error...However, it is easily understood how  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  could give way to  $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , given the appearance of “the only begotten Son” at John 3:16 and 18. “Only-begotten Son” is Johannine in character, and hence would naturally cause a scribe to write  $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , upon writing  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  [only begotten] rather than  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ .*

*“Therefore, it is most logical to conclude that  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  is the original reading that gave rise to all the other variants, including the reading that is found in the majority of the Greek texts. The internal evidence, coupled with the ancient attestation of the reading in the papyri especially, leads one to take this reading with confidence. This decision is not arrived at due to Gnostic or heretical beliefs or leanings, but simply due to the external evidence itself.”*

Citing the Greek-English lexicon of Louw and Nida, White inserts a note to justify the NIV reading “God the One and Only” in John 1:18 as follows. *“The translation “only-begotten” is inferior to “unique.” It was thought that the term  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$  (monos), meaning “only” and  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\omega$  (gennaō) meaning “begotten.” However, further research has determined that the term is derived not from  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\omega$  but from  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  (genos), meaning “kind” or “type.” Hence the better translation, “unique” or “one of a kind.””*

Cloud<sup>6</sup>Part 4 comments as follows, his emphases.

***“Consider another example of White’s misstatement of the evidence. In his chart on page 197 he claims that the KJV omits one witness to Christ’s deity which he claims the NIV and the NASB contain. This is in John 1:18. Consider the following comparison of this verse in the NIV and the KJV -***

*John 1:18 KJV - “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.”*

*John 1:18 NIV - “No one has ever seen God, but God the only Son, who is at the Father’s side, has made him known.”*

*“It does appear, at first glance, that the NIV is superior in this verse in its witness to Christ’s deity in that it reads “God the only Son.” The KJV, on the other hand, has “the only begotten Son.” What White **does not** explain to his readers is this: In the King*



*James Bible, following the Received Text, John had introduced the term “only begotten Son” four verses prior to verse 18, and he has connected this unique term directly to Christ’s eternal deity in verse one. Thus, one who reads the King James Bible or any other faithful Received Text Bible is made to understand that the phrase “only begotten Son” is a direct reference to Christ’s eternal Godhead. This phrase appears in John 1:4, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9. In each of these verses the NIV changes this important doctrinal phrase “only begotten” to “one and only,” which is not even a true statement. Jesus Christ is not God’s one and only Son (born again believers are sons of God - Heb. 2:10), but Christ is the **only begotten** Son. We thus disagree with White’s assessment of this passage, and reject his claim that the KJV omits Christ’s deity from John 1:18. In reality, the modern versions, including the NIV, have perverted the doctrine of Christ by removing the key phrase “only begotten” in all five verses in which it should appear. John 1:18 in the NIV, by its erroneous dynamic equivalency translation, teaches false doctrine.”*

The up-to-date online NIV continues to read “one and only” instead of “**only begotten**” but at least one edition of the NIV nevertheless contains “**only begotten.**” See below.

Further concerning “*the external evidence of the text*” Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 716</sup> indicates that the pre-700 AD Anglo Saxon bibles and the bibles of Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bshops<sup>138</sup> all agree with the AV1611 in John 1:18 – representing the God-honoured, bible-believing textual tradition as providentially preserved from apostolic times.

Against P66, P75,  $\aleph$  and its first corrector, B, C, L and the Syriac Peshitta in favour of the modern reading for John 1:18, Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 100</sup> lists 27 uncials in support of the AV1611 reading and in addition to the majority of the cursives, Families 1 and 13, as indicated earlier representing a 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century text<sup>9 p 27</sup>, contemporaneous with P66, P75,  $\aleph$  and B and most of the Old Latin. Dr Moorman states of the modern reading, “*This is the classic Gnostic perversion with its doctrine of “intermediary gods.” This is the trademark of corruption in the early Egyptian manuscripts which unfortunately spread to some others.*”

White accuses Donald Waite of presenting “no discussion of the understanding of the passage” but White presents “no discussion” of “*the classic Gnostic perversion with its doctrine of “intermediary gods”*” that Dr Moorman has highlighted with respect to the modern reading for John 1:18. Further discussion of this “*classic Gnostic perversion*” of John 1:18 as found in P66, P75,  $\aleph$  and B and the modern versions will take place below.

In answer to White’s notion that, “*The survey of the Fathers also shows the wide-spread nature of this reading*” i.e. “*only-begotten God,*” or more accurately, the “*unique God,*”” Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 47</sup> lists the Fathers as follows, with respect to their support for either the AV1611 reading or the modern reading. Note that both readings are to be found in the writings of some Fathers.

In support of the AV1611, in chronological order:

Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Archelaus, Methodius, Alexander of Alexandria, Hilary of Potiers, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzen, Ambrose

In support of the modern reading, in chronological order:

Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa

In other words, the Fathers support the AV1611 reading “*only begotten Son*” in John 1:18 against the modern reading “*only begotten God*” or “*unique God*” in ratio 9:2, if Irenaeus, Origen, Athanasius and Basil the Great are excluded as appearing in both lists. If they are included in each list, the ratio is 13:6, i.e. still substantially in favour of the AV1611. As usual, White has withheld important evidence in order to reinforce his dubious stance.

As indicated above, this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 331ff</sup> has addressed John 1:18. Relevant extracts follow, with updated references.

*“Our critic’s next attack on the Holy Bible is against John 1:18, where he objects to the expression “only begotten Son” on the grounds that:*

*“Both external evidence (Most reliable manuscripts and the earliest fathers) and internal evidence (A later scribe has clearly harmonised with other passages in John which read “only” or “only begotten” Son...) plainly indicate that John originally wrote “God” not “Son.”*

*“This is another example where the KJV (here using a defective manuscript...) fails to affirm that Jesus is God” ...*

*“Our critic does not state what the “most reliable manuscripts” are nor which “defective manuscript” the AV1611 translators used. I will now make up for these deficiencies, first from Dr. Hills<sup>65 p 133-134</sup>: “The Only Begotten Son Versus Only Begotten God”*

*“John 1:18...This verse exhibits the following four-fold variation:*

- (1) *“the only begotten Son,” Traditional Text, Latin versions, Curetonian Syriac.*
- (2) *“only begotten God,” Pap 66, Aleph, B, C, L, W-H*
- (3) *“the only begotten God” Pap 75*
- (4) *“(the) only begotten,” read by one Latin manuscript.”*

*...“Dr. Hills shows that the “most reliable manuscripts”, according to our critic are, in fact, P66, P75, Aleph, B, C, L although he has said...that “Modern editions of the NT are not dominated by Vaticanus and Sinaiticus” which were “overestimated by Westcott” and that to imagine otherwise “is quite fallacious.” Nevertheless, our critic has revealed here that Aleph and B are still AMONG the most dominant mss....”*

See **Chapter 3 – ‘Starting at the Beginning’** for discussion of the nature of P66, P75 and Codices  $\aleph$  and B.

Additional comments from Dr Hills’s work are inserted here.

*“The first reading is the genuine one. The other three are plainly heretical. Burgon (1896 [i.e. Burgon’s work published<sup>131</sup> by Miller]) long ago traced these corruptions of the sacred text to their source, namely Valentinus. Burgon pointed out that the first time John 1:18 is quoted by any of the ancients a reference is made to the doctrines of Valentinus. This quotation is found in a fragment entitled Excerpts from Theodotus, which dates from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. R. P. Casey (1934) translates it as follows:*

*“The verse, “in the beginning was the Logos and the Logos was with God and the Logos was God,” the Valentinians understand thus, for they say that “the beginning” is the “Only Begotten” and that he is also called God, as also in the verses which immediately follow it explains that he is God, for it says, “The Only-Begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him.””*

*“This passage is very obscure, but at least it is clear that the reading favored by Valentinus was precisely that now found in Papyrus 75, the only begotten God. What could be more probable than Dean Burgon’s suggestion that Valentinus fabricated this reading by changing the only begotten Son to the only begotten God? His motive for doing so would be his apparent desire to distinguish between the Son and the Word (Logos). According to the Traditional reading, the Word mentioned in John 1:14 is identified with the only begotten Son mentioned in John 1:18. Is it not likely that Valentinus, denying such identification, sought to reinforce his denial by the easy method of altering Son to God (a change of only one letter in Greek [‘Son’ is υιος, huios, ‘God’ is θεος, theos, both terms in lower case without accents. If the words were abbreviated, only one letter change would be necessary to change ‘Son’ to ‘God’]) and using this word God in an inferior sense to refer to the Word rather than the Son? This procedure would enable him to deny that in John 1:14 the Word is identified with the Son. He could argue that in both these verses the reference is to the Word and that therefore the Word and the Son are two distinct Beings.*

*“Thus we see that it is unwise in present-day translators to base the texts of their modern versions on recent papyrus discoveries or on B and Aleph. For all these documents come from Egypt, and Egypt during the early Christian centuries was a land in which heresies were rampant. So much was this so that, as Bauer (1934) and van Unnik (1958) have pointed out, later Egyptian Christians seem to have been ashamed of the heretical past of their country and to have drawn a veil of silence across it. This seems to be why so little is known of the history of early Egyptian Christianity. In view, therefore, of the heretical character of the early Egyptian Church, it is not surprising that the papyri, B, Aleph, and other manuscripts which hail from Egypt are liberally sprinkled with heretical readings.”*

Kevin James<sup>76 p 12</sup> notes that, his emphases, *“Valentinus was one second century heretic. He believed that Jesus Christ was never real flesh and blood but a kind of revealed spirit. In a fragment of manuscript entitled Excerpts from Theodotus, the writer says that the Valentinians quoted John 1:18 with the variation “the only begotten **God**” for “the only begotten **Son**”...*

*“The only witnesses that agree exactly with Valentinus are Papyrus 75 (third century) and manuscript 33 (ninth century). However, Nestle’s modern Greek text and modern bibles read “only begotten God,” omitting the “the” on the authority of Papyrus 66 (AD 200), Aleph, B and a few other witnesses [Nestle inserts “the” in brackets and the NASV follows suit, although without brackets or any indication of the insertion]. The King James, backed by over 900 Greek manuscripts, opposes this deviation from the correct “the only begotten Son.””*

White<sup>3 p 274</sup> has listed the works by both Hills and James in his bibliography. Why did he not discuss this information? This author’s work continues.

*“What of the other sources, which are with Aleph and B, the “Most reliable manuscripts”?*

*“Of C, Codex Ephraemi, Dr. Ruckman<sup>33 p 315, 18 p 408</sup> describes it as a “palimpsest” “which simply means a worked-over work that has been partly erased, with another text written over it...written in the fifth-century A.D...”*

*““It is very incomplete, containing now only sixty-four Old Testament leaves and 145 New Testament leaves...All New Testament books are present except for 2 Thessalonians and 2 John... (but) it omits Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings and all of the major and minor prophets.”*

*“Burgon says of this ms. <sup>13 p 325</sup> “Codex C, after having had ‘at least three correctors very busily at work upon it’ (in the VI<sup>th</sup> and IX<sup>th</sup> centuries), finally (in the XII<sup>th</sup>) was fairly obliterated, - literally scraped out, - to make room for the writings of a Syrian Father” ...*

*“Burgon also noted the tendency of C to disagree with Aleph and B...He discusses in detail <sup>13 p 11-17</sup> the variations, describing C as “fragmentary” and concludes “It is discovered that in the 111 (out of 320) pages of an ordinary copy of the Greek Testament, in which alone these five manuscripts are collectively available for comparison in the Gospels...The readings peculiar to A...are 133: those peculiar to C are 170. But those of B amount to 197: while Aleph exhibits 443: and the readings peculiar to D...are no fewer than 1829...We submit that these facts...are by no means calculated to inspire confidence in codices B, Aleph, C, D.” Or in the opinions of James White and his cronies. This author’s work continues.*

*“Of Codex L, Burgon <sup>64 p 81-82</sup> states “Of the eighth or ninth century...It is chiefly remarkable for the correspondence of its readings with those of Codex B and with certain of the citations in Origen...a peculiarity which recommends Codex L...to the special favour of a school with which whatever is found in Codex B is necessarily right.”*

*“Burgon continues: “(Codex L) is described as the work of an ignorant foreign copyist...who is found to have been wholly incompetent to determine which reading to adopt and which to reject...evidently incapable of distinguishing the grossest fabrication from the genuine text...”*

*“Burgon therefore describes L...as exhibiting “an exceedingly vicious text” ...*

*“Having identified our critic’s “most reliable MSS”, I return to the variant readings, listed by Dr. Hills. Gail Riplinger states <sup>14 p 338-339</sup>:*

*““Arius (260-336), a student of Origen’s, crusaded for Jesus as “the begotten God,” only to be met by campaigning Christians like Athanasius (296-373), Hilary (315-367), and Ambrose (339-397) armed with “the only begotten Son” in their canon’s mouth.” Dr. Ruckman <sup>18 p 119</sup> mentions Chrysostom (347-407) as also opposing Arius’ teachings. Gail Riplinger continues:*

*““The further swell of Arianism by A.D. 330 prompted Constantine to replace semi-Arian Eusebius of Caesarea with Arian Eusebius of Nicodemia...It is in this climate that Constantine requested the production of manuscripts B and Aleph. Their use of “only begotten God” in John 1:18 was no doubt a political expedient.*

*““The term “the only begotten Son” is seen in the vast majority of MSS and is witnessed to by the earliest extant record of John 1:18, Tertullian in A.D. 150. Even Allen Wikgren of the UBS Greek New Testament committee admits:*

*“““It is doubtful that the author would have written ‘begotten God’ which may be a primitive, transcriptual error in the Alexandrian tradition.””*

*“Note that our critic neglected to list Tertullian amongst his “earliest Fathers”, none of whom he actually identified. Gail Riplinger strips away the veil of anonymity.*

*““The critical apparatus of the UBS Greek New Testament cites P66, P75, Aleph, B, C, and L, as well as Valentinus (who changed “begotten Son” to “begotten God”), Theodotus, Clement, Origen and Arius, as support for their use of “begotten God,” in spite of the doctrinal bias of these witnesses.”*

*“She cites Westcott from his...commentary *The Gospel According to St. John* p 159 as follows:*

““It is impossible to suppose that two beings distinct in essence could be equal in power. We find ourselves met by difficulty which belongs to the idea of begetting...If we keep both (Arianism and Sabellianism) before us [i.e. embrace both heresies] we may hope to attain...to that knowledge of the truth.”” Dr. Hills<sup>65 p 34</sup> explains “The teaching of Sabellius (220 A.D.) (was) that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are merely three ways in which God has revealed Himself...these false doctrines culminated in the greatest heresy of all, namely, the contention of Arius (318 A.D.) that before the foundation of the world God the Father had created the Son out of nothing.”

“It now becomes apparent why our critic then states “Much scholarly discussion has centered around whether monogenes means “only begotten” or “only”...I am inclined to believe that the better translation is “only”, this indicating Christ’s uniqueness.”

“Having insisted, along with Valentinus, Origen, Arius etc. that John 1:18 should read “God” instead of “Son,” our critic CANNOT agree with “begotten.” The reason is clear. As Dr. Ruckman states<sup>18 p 119</sup> “The teaching that Jesus Christ is a “god,” begotten in Eternity (or sometime before Genesis 1:1) is the official theology of the Jehovah’s Witnesses.”

“It is also Edwin Palmer’s theology, “From all eternity the Father begat the Son”<sup>14 p 339</sup>. The reason why Palmer’s NIV (Hodder & Stoughton 1979) omits “begotten” from John 1:18 and reads “No-one has ever seen God, but God the only (Son)” is discussed in Section 13.2 [where Palmer is quoted as saying that “The Holy Spirit did not beget the Son”]. However, there is some confusion in the ranks of NIV editors because the Gideon edition, 1983, REINSERTS “begotten” and reads “No-one has ever seen God, but the only begotten (Son).” The Gideon edition re-inserted “begotten” in John 1:14, 1:18, 3:16, 3:18; Acts 13:33; Hebrews 1:5, 5:5 and 1 John 4:19 exactly where the AV1611 has it and from where the H&S NIV removed it.

“However, bracketing of the word “Son” in both editions of the NIV means that the editors regard the word as UNCERTAIN, p viii Preface. Neither NIV, therefore, is absolutely clear that Jesus Christ is even referred to in John 1:18.

“Earlier in his document, our critic asked “which of all these various revisions is the real KJV?”...One could now reasonably pose a similar question<sup>90 p 18</sup> “Which version of the New International Version is the true version of the New International Version?”

“To return to “monogenes,” the TBS Article No. 58 The Only Begotten Son cites “Professor Cremer’s great Lexicon of N.T. Greek...” as giving “monogenes – “only-begotten.””. Gail Riplinger<sup>14 p 342</sup> states “The Greek word preceding ‘Son’...is always “monogenes,” a two part word in which “mono” means ‘only’ or ‘one’ and “genes” means ‘begotten’, ‘born’, ‘come forth’. Buschel, in his definitive treatise on the meaning of the word ‘monogenes’ said, “It means only-begotten.” All inter-linear Greek-English New Testaments translate it as such.”

“Nestle is no exception and even Vine - no friend of the AV1611 - gives “only begotten” as the meaning of “monogenes”, adding that it “has the meaning “only” of human offspring, in Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38.

“Vine has a more honest assessment of the three verses in Luke than our critic, who cites them to justify rendering “monogenes” as “only” IMMEDIATELY after referring to CHRIST’S uniqueness - see above.

“The “uniqueness” of the Lord Jesus Christ was that He did NOT have a human father! The three individuals in Luke DID! D. A. Carson also uses the verses in Luke to obscure

the meaning of “monogenes”<sup>145 p 36</sup>. Obviously it is not necessary to translate “genes” in these verses - nor would it be good style. (Isaac, Hebrews 11:17, is an exception because “he was a type of Jesus Christ (see Gal. 3:16), the only son begotten by promise and command (Gen. 17:21, Gal. 4:28)”<sup>145 p 37</sup>.)

“Our critic then claims that the distinction between “only” and “only begotten” was not drawn “until Jerome’s Vulgate” which allegedly influenced “the KJV.” See Section 11.1. The TBS Article No. 58 flatly refutes this: “The Old Latin translation was made not later than the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, and it is significant that the translators who were in a position to know how the word MONOGENES was understood by contemporary Greek Christians, rendered it UNIGENTIUS - “only-begotten,” not UNICUS – “only”. It is therefore clear that the rendering “only begotten Son” in the Authorised Version is well supported by ancient evidence.””

“The Old Latin pre-dated Jerome by 200 years<sup>12 p 344</sup>.

“Our critic continues to defend “only” by means of theology. “While...others in the Bible are called “sons of God” there is a radical and fundamental difference in Christ’s sonship compared with theirs (Matt.11:25-27)...Others are sons in a derivative and much lesser sense since they are sinners dependent on God’s grace. In Johannine theology Christ’s Sonship is equivalent to equality with the Father (John 5:18). In this sense he is truly the Only Son. To attempt to suggest that Christ’s Sonship is different only in degree but not in kind is to take essentially a Unitarian position.”

“This is our critic’s reaction to the simple statement in Section 7.3 “the modern reading (of John 1:18) cannot be correct, according to Job 1:6, Luke 3:38 and John 1:12, which show that Jesus Christ is NOT God’s “one and only son.””

“Our critic did not check the verses. Job 1:6 was a reference to ANGELS, who HAD kept “their first estate”, Jude 6 and had NOT sinned, 2 Peter 2:4 and were NOT therefore “sinners dependent on God’s grace”. Luke 3:38 was a reference to ADAM, who was God’s son BEFORE he sinned.

“John 1:12 refers, of course, to those who are God’s sons by adoption - not “derivation”, having received Christ by faith, Ephesians 1:5. Although “they are sinners dependent on God’s grace”, nowhere does the Bible speak of them as sons in a “much lesser sense”. Quite the reverse is true:

“**“For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones”** Ephesians 5:30.

“**“For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren”** Hebrews 2:11.

“**“Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; because as he is, so are we in this world”** 1 John 4:17.

“Of course these verses refer to one’s STANDING in Christ. One’s state may be different.

“Our critic’s reference to Unitarianism is ironic. It is the JWs, the modern Unitarians who have adopted the reading from our critic’s “most reliable MSS.” for their New World Translation, NWT. It was their spiritual ancestors who made the change in the first place<sup>14 p 338-339</sup>.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 1</sup> writes, her emphases, with respect to White’s (and our critic’s) opinion of “**only begotten.**”

““There is a bird which is named the Phoenix...the **only one**...makes for itself a coffin of frankincense and myrrh...then dies. But as the **flesh rots**, a certain **worm** is engendered which is nurtured from the moisture of the dead **creature** and puts forth wings...It takes up that coffin where are the bones of its parent, and carrying them, it journeys...to the place called the City of the Sun.”

“This depraved pagan parody of the death, burial, and resurrection of our precious Saviour is given by NIV editor Richard Longenecker to ‘help’ us understand WHY the NIV translates John 1:14 and 1:18 as “One and Only” instead of “only BEGOTTEN” (see *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, pp. 119-126). He points also to such occult literature as the magical papyri’s “One”, Plato’s (*Critias*) “one,” and the Orphic Hymn’s (gnostic) “only one”. He cites numerous other early Greek writers, like Parmenides, head of the Eleatic School. He brought **pantheism** to the West after his trips to India and initiation into the Greek mysteries. Do we look to a pantheist and their god ‘the One’ to alter **our** view of God?

“Longenecker chides the KJV’s “begotten Son” because “it neglects the current [time of Christ] usage for the word.” Current usage amongst PAGAN OCCULTISTS should **not change** how Christians use words! He and the NIV translators have broadened the “semantic range of meaning” (Longenecker p. 122) to include the broad way that leadeth to destruction. The translators of the **King James Version** were so highly educated that they not only **knew of** these Greek quotes, but knew **who** Parmenides was and what he taught. They wouldn’t touch such pagan sources. Either the NIV translators are **ignorant** of the philosophies of those they cite, like Aeschylus, Plato and Parmenides, and the Orphic Hymns **or** they are **sympathetic** to such ideas. (The “begotten God” seen in John 1:18 in the NASB comes directly from lexical support from the occult tome *The Trimorphic Proitenoia!*)

“Anyone who has spent years studying the **resources** used to **generate** the definitions seen in Greek lexicons will get a chuckle out of White’s comment: “I explained that she was in error regarding the meaning of monogenes, and explained the actual meaning of the term.” Even Longenecker **admits** the translation of monogenes [only begotten] and huiois [Son] “have become bones of contention among Christians.”

“**Real** scholars like Buchsel (*The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. IV, pp. 737-741) allot five entire pages of lexical evidence to the meaning of monogenes. Buchsel proves that White’s “actual” definition of monogenes is **only** that of a **few** pagan philosophers. New version editors and advocates seem to pick the pagan lexical definition, time after time. (Imagine, for example, if 2000 years from now, a lexicographer reviewed our culture’s use of the word “love.” They would find the KJV’s definition of ‘charity’ **and** Hugh Hefner’s definition of ‘sex’.)

“White may not understand my response<sup>96 p 62</sup> in *Which Bible Is God’s Word*, but Buchsel does, and agrees with **me**. He says, “Though many will not accept this; he here understands the concept of sonship in terms of begetting.”

Kinney<sup>146</sup> adds, with respect to “**only begotten**” versus “one and only,” “In spite of some Greek lexicons, like Thayer’s, which insist the meaning of monogenes is “unique” or “one of a kind”, there are many others like Kittel’s, Liddel and Scott and Vine’s that tell us the Greek word monogenes emphatically means “only begotten” and not “one and only”. It is significant that Thayer did not believe that Jesus Christ was God.

“In Kittel’s massive work Volume 4 page 741 the writer says: “In John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9 monogenes denotes more than the uniqueness or incomparability of Jesus.

*In all these verses He is expressly called the Son. (Notice he does not accept the false reading of 'God' in 1:18, and he states this on the previous page). In John monogenes denotes the origin of Jesus as the only begotten."*

*"Even the modern Greek language dictionary, which has nothing to do with the Bible, says that monogenes means "only begotten", and not unique. The Greek word for "unique" or "one and only" is a very different and specific word - monodikos - not monogenes.*

*"The translators of the King James Version were not unaware that monogenes can also be translated as "only" for they did so in Luke 7:12; 8:42; and 9:38, all of which refer to an only child and thus they were the only begotten, not an unique child."*

A. Hembd<sup>147</sup> p 32-33 has these comments on the meaning of the term "monogenes," his emphases.

*"A modern scholar, Richard Longnecker, has stated that monogenes in the Greek means 'one and only of a kind'...Longnecker argues that monogenes is formed of two Greek words (which it is), with monos meaning 'one' or 'only' and genos 'kind.' Thus, says he, μονογενης means 'one of a kind' or a unique kind.' Where we see monogenes huios, it properly means to Longnecker 'the only and unique Son,' whereas monogenes theos means to him, 'the only and unique God.' Thus, according to Longnecker and men of like sentiments with him, John 1:18 should follow the Greek of Vaticanus, but translating it in this way: 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only and unique God, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'*

*"While we must commend Longnecker for seeing the impropriety of the 'only begotten God' rendering, we cannot agree with his defence of Vaticanus's reading of monogenes theos, and that, for the following...reasons.*

*"1. Genos (γενος) properly refers to an offspring whether literal or figurative. Thus monogenes would mean 'a unique offspring,' which also would then mean (as it always does in the New Testament) 'only begotten.' The Greek word genos, from which we get the word 'genus,' in its literal sense refers to the offspring of an ancestor, thus we see in the Greek of the New testament, Christ is referred to as the genos of David, that is, the offspring of David. We also see Israel referred to as the 'stock' or offspring of Abraham in Acts 13:26: 'Men **and** brethren, children of the stock of Abraham,' begins Paul in his address to the synagogue in Antioch of Pisidia. The word used for 'stock' is our word genos. He is calling them the offspring of David..."*

*"Genos may also refer to an offspring of a prototype, figuratively speaking, and thus to a 'kind.' However when genos is used to mean 'kind,' it always means that it is a **figurative offspring**, figuratively descended from a prototype of some sort. Our English word for 'kind' also follows this principle. Our word 'kind' comes from the Germanic word kint (pronounced kint), which means 'a child' [as in 'kindergarten']. Thus, our word 'kind' properly means a figurative child, that is, 'a child of a prototype.'*

*"But now in coming to the term monogenes, that term always means 'only offspring.' That term **always** is used in the New Testament to denote an only child...Michale Marlowe, though himself an advocate generally of the critical text, has also written a paper in which he shows that monogenes means 'only begotten.'*

*"3. Athanasius and the Nicene Fathers, who knew the Greek of the New Testament far better than modern scholars do, being much nearer the period when that language was spoken, regularly referred to John 1:14, John 1:18 and John 3:16 as speaking of Christ*



as the only begotten Son. In speaking of Christ as *monogenes huios*, the Nicene Fathers referred to Christ as the only and unique offspring of the Father, and sometimes simply as the offspring of the Father.

“4. This being the case, along with the fact that *genos* **always** refers to an offspring of some sort, *monogenes* could **never** refer to God, or in no sense is God the offspring of another. God is not a kind descended from another prototype, for He is indeed the First Cause and Prime Mover of all things, as Aquinas rightly noted. Nor is the Godhead of Christ begotten. It is properly **only His Person** which is begotten. Thus, *monogenes theos*, as the Nicene Fathers rightly understood, cannot mean ‘the only and unique God.’ Rather, it would mean ‘the only offspring God,’ or ‘the only begotten God’ – and the phrase is at best a very harsh catachresis [perversion], and cannot be but offensive to orthodox ears.”

Dean Burgon<sup>131 p 198ff, 215ff</sup> has these comments about the corruption of John 1:18.

“The men who first systematically depraved the text of Scripture, were as we now must know the heresiarchs Basilides (flourished. 134 AD), Valentinus (flourished. 140 AD), and Marcion (flourished. 150 AD): three names which Origen is observed almost invariably to enumerate together...these old heretics retained, altered, transposed, just so much as they pleased of the fourfold Gospel: and further, that they imported whatever additional matter they saw fit:— not that they rejected the inspired text entirely, and substituted something of their own invention in its place...

“We now reach a most remarkable instance. It will be remembered that St. John in his grand preface does not rise to the full height of his sublime argument until he reaches the eighteenth verse. He had said (ver. 14) that the ‘Word was made flesh,’ &c.; a statement which Valentinus was willing to admit. But, as we have seen, the heresiarch and his followers denied that ‘the Word’ is also ‘the Son’ of God. As if in order to bar the door against this pretence, St. John announces (ver. 18) that ‘the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him’: thus establishing the identity of the Word and the Only begotten Son. What else could the Valentinians do with so plain a statement, but seek to deprave it? Accordingly, the very first time St. John i. 18 is quoted by any of the ancients, it is accompanied by the statement that the Valentinians in order to prove that the ‘only begotten’ is ‘the Beginning,’ and is ‘God,’ appeal to the words, — ‘the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father,’ &c. Inasmuch, said they, as the Father willed to become known to the worlds, the Spirit of Gnosis produced the ‘only begotten’ ‘Gnosis,’ and therefore gave birth to ‘Gnosis,’ that is to ‘the Son’: in order that by ‘the Son’ ‘the Father’ might be made known. While then that ‘only begotten Son’ abode ‘in the bosom of the Father,’ He caused that here upon earth should be seen, alluding to ver. 14, one ‘as the only begotten Son.’ In which, by the way, the reader is requested to note that the author of the *Excerpta Theodoti* (a production of the second century) reads St. John i. 18 as we do.

“I have gone into all these strange details, — derived, let it be remembered, from documents which carry us back to the former half of the second century, — because in no other way is the singular phenomenon which attends the text of St. John i. 18 to be explained and accounted for. Sufficiently plain and easy of transmission as it is, this verse of Scripture is observed to exhibit perturbations which are even extraordinary.”

Dean Burgon then comments on the variant readings found amongst the Church Fathers, giving the true perspective on James White’s equivocal statement, “*The survey of the Fathers also shows the wide-spread nature of this reading, and the fact that such notably*

*orthodox men as Gregory, the bishop of Nyssa, a staunch defender of the doctrine of the Trinity, knew this reading and found no objection to it; rather he utilized it often in his writings as evidence of the glory of Christ.” Dean Burgon writes.*

*“Irenaeus once writes ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός [the only begotten son]: once, ὁ μονογενῆς Θεός [the only begotten God]: once, ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός Θεός [the only begotten son of God]: Clemens Alex., ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός Θεός μόνος [the only begotten son of God alone]...Eusebius four times writes ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός [the only begotten son]: twice, μονογενῆς Θεός [only begotten God]: and on one occasion gives his reader the choice of either expression, explaining why both may stand. Gregory Nyss. and Basil, though they recognize the usual reading of the place, are evidently vastly more familiar with the reading ὁ μονογενῆς Θεός [the only begotten God]: for Basil adopts the expression thrice, and Gregory nearly thirty-three times as often. This was also the reading of Cyril Alex. whose usual phrase however is ὁ μονογενῆς τοῦ Θεός λόγος [the only begotten word of God]. Didymus has only ὁ μονογενῆς Θεός [the only begotten God], — for which he once writes ὁ μονογενῆς Θεός λόγος. [the only begotten word of God] Cyril of Jer. seems to have read ὁ μονογενῆς μόνος [the only begotten alone].”*

The variety of readings and the evident familiarity of the Fathers with both the Traditional and modern readings for John 1:18 indicates that the Patristic evidence is not nearly so heavily in favour of the modern reading as White would have his readers believe.

Edward Miller, Prebendary of Chichester, edited Burgon’s work, which was published in 1896 and made<sup>131 p vi-vii, 218</sup> additional comments on John 1:18.

*“Something however must be said in reply to an attack made in the Guardian newspaper [not surprising] on May 20, because it represents in the main the position occupied by some members of an existing School...*

*“The reviewer appears also to be entirely unacquainted with the history of the phrase μονογενῆς Θεός [only begotten God] in St. John I 18, which, as may be read on pp. 215-218, was introduced by heretics and harmonized with Arian tenets, and was rejected on the other side. That some orthodox churchmen fell into the trap, and like those who in these days are not aware of the pedigree and use of the phrase, employed it even for good purposes, is only an instance of a strange phenomenon. We must not be led only by first impressions as to what is to be taken for the genuine words of the Gospels. Even if phrases or passages make for orthodoxy, to accept them if condemned by evidence and history is to alight upon the quicksands of conjecture.”*

James White should take careful note. Prebendary Miller continues with respect to Burgon’s citations of the Fathers.

*“[T]he most important part of the Dean’s paper is found in his account of the origin of the expression. This inference is strongly confirmed by the employment of it in the Arian controversy. Arius reads Θεός [God] (ap. Epiph. 73 — Tischendorf), whilst his opponents read Υἱός [Son]. So Faustinus seven times (I noted him only thrice), and Victorinus Afer six (10) times in reply to the Arian Candidus. Also Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers four times each, and Ambrose eight (add Epp. I. xxii. 5). It is curious that with this history admirers of B and 8 should extol their reading over the Traditional reading on the score of orthodoxy. Heresy had and still retains associations which cannot be ignored: in this instance some of the orthodox weakly played into the hands of heretics. None may read Holy Scripture just as the idea strikes them.”*

James White again should take careful note. The work of Burgon and Miller, together with the other material cited above and following gives the lie to White's notion that "there is no evidence given that Gnostics had anything to do with "changing" the reading at John 1:18." Considerable such evidence exists. White either ignored it or was too inept to investigate it. Note that Hembd<sup>147 p 33</sup> states in this context, "the very first reference to this 'only begotten God' reading occurs in the writing of a follower of Valentinus, who was a very wicked heretic. The Valentinians believed that Monogenes, the only begotten, was a god, and that he proceeded from Bythos<sup>148</sup>, [occult term meaning 'depth']. But they believed that the Son was another god, yet who was formed by Monogenes. Their wicked heresies were well exposed to all eternity by the godly Irenaeus." See discussion above by Burgon.

White<sup>3 p 220</sup> also chides Dr Grady<sup>98 p 95</sup> for supposedly assuming that "Origen is the source of this reading ["only begotten God"]" and for stating that, Dr Grady's emphasis, "Origen embraced the Arian position that Jesus was **created** by the Father, and therefore not total Deity."

White insists, his emphasis, that "Arius arose after Origen, hence it is anachronistic to say that Origen embraced a position that developed later. Origen's theology tended towards subordinationism, but he did not take the system as far as Arius would years later. Second... *μονογενής Θεός* is also found in P66 and P75, both of which **predate** Origen!"

Since White read Barry Burton's work<sup>149, p 64</sup> – see later, why didn't he allude to Burton's citation of the *New Standard Encyclopedia*, vol. 9 p 155, his emphases?

"**Subordinating** the Son to the Father, [Origen] treated Christ as the Logos (**created by God**) who brings reason to the world... This doctrine provided the foundation for the fourth century Arian Doctrine."

If Origen never "embraced a position [heresy] that developed later" he nevertheless instigated it or furthered it. As for the reading "only begotten God" in P66, P75, predating Origen, note Burgon's statement above, "the *Excerpta Theodoti* (a production of the second century) reads St. John i. 18 as we do" i.e. "**only begotten Son.**" As Dr Moorman points out - see above - Irenaeus<sup>130 p 28, 30</sup> quotes both readings for John 1:18 – see also Burgon's detailed comments – and he was 55 years old when Origen was born, so P66, P75, dated no earlier than 200 AD<sup>9 p 17</sup>, cannot contain the 'original' reading supposedly changed later to yield the AV1611 reading. White has again misled his readers – and on this occasion unfairly criticised Dr Grady's work.

Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 119</sup> has this summary comment, his emphasis.

"John 1:18. ...Origen has written "*μονογενής Θεός...*" "the only begotten GOD..."

"But this is a doctrinal statement on Arianism, the heresy that Orthodox Christians were supposed to have defeated at the Council of Nicea (325 AD). Is it not very "archaic" to teach, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a doctrine which was thrown out by the Body of Christ more than 1400 years ago?"

*“The AV1611 corrects this phoney Greek reading, which is obviously Origen’s own opinion about Jesus Christ, preserved in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and “C” (the Alexandrian family of manuscripts!). Tertullian (150), Athanasius (325), and Chrysostom (345) did not accept Origen’s reading here, but Westcott and Hort, A. T. Robertson, Warfield, Schaff, and Machen are still teaching the young ministers (through their books) that this reading is in the “best and oldest manuscript”!*

*“The teaching that Jesus Christ is a “god,” begotten in Eternity (or sometime before Genesis 1:1), is the official teaching of the Jehovah Witnesses. In their “bible,” one will find that Jesus (the word) was a “god” in John 1:1 – not God but “a god.” Servetus (1511-1553) was burned at the stake for refusing to believe that the “begetting” was **eternal**; he thought the “begetting” took place when Jesus Christ was born of Mary – exactly as it appears in the context! (See Hebrews 1:6!)”*

Dr Thomas Holland<sup>55 p 23-4, 179-182</sup> has further comment on the Gnostic deprecation of John 1:18 and the supposed superior translation of *monogenes* as “unique.”

*“In general, the Gnostics taught that the physical was evil and the spiritual was good. A good god could not have created a physical world because good cannot create evil. So the Gnostic god created a being (or a line of beings called aeons) and one of these aeons, or gods, created the world. The so-called Christian Gnostics believed that Jesus was one of these aeons who created the world...”*

*“The influence of Gnosticism may be felt today. For example, the Christian Gnostics taught that Jesus Christ was an aeon, a created god who in turn created the world. To them, Christ was a begotten god from the “Unbegotten Father.” The Authorized Version refers to Christ as, “the only begotten Son” (John 1:18). This is a literal translation of the Greek *monogenes huios*. However, some of the Egyptian manuscripts read *monogenes theos* (the only begotten god). The change in the Greek manuscripts reflects a textual variant that also happens to agree with Gnostic thought. It is possible that *huios* (Son) was changed to *theos* (God) to reflect Gnostic teaching.”*

Dr Holland includes the following notes on his analysis of the Gnostic heresy.

*“Gregory of Nyssa, the fourth century Greek father, confounded the doctrine of the Gnostics in *Dogmatic Treatises*. He compares their teaching regarding Christ as a begotten god to their teaching that God the Father is the Unbegotten God, using the Greek word *agennetos*.*

*“Many ancient Christian Gnostics, or those influenced by their teachings, use the textual variant *monogenes theos*. This is the reading used by Tatian [Tatian<sup>130 p 47</sup> has “the only Son, God which...”], Arius, and the followers of Valentinus, thus agreeing with their teaching that Christ was a created or begotten god. Dr Allen Wikgren, who served on the committee producing the United Bible Societies Greek text, rejected the reading *monogenes theos* and suggests it was introduced as a primitive transcriptional error (Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., p 170\*). Those who opposed Gnosticism, such as Irenaeus, Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nyssa, cite John 1:18 as *monogenes huios*. This is consistent with other Johannine passages (John 3:16, 18, 1 John 4:9).”*

\*Why doesn’t White mention this source? He<sup>3 p 151, 185, 261</sup> regards Bruce Metzger as a true Christian scholar, exhibiting “openness” and faithfulness in translation. What happened to White’s “openness” at this point?

Dr Holland continues, enlarging on his earlier comments, his emphasis.

*“There is a difference in the Greek texts [underlying] these two translations. However, there is another problem that has to do with the Greek word monogenes...There is a growing movement to understand this word as ‘unique, one of a kind,’ or simply ‘only’...”*

*“Many of the current handbooks on Greek syntax state that monogenes should **not** be translated as ‘only begotten.’ Instead, they take the word to mean ‘only’ or ‘unique’...”*

*“The problem here is a misunderstanding of the Greek language...The word monogenes does mean ‘one’ or ‘unique’ in the sense that an only child is the only one of his parents. It does not mean unique, as in ‘special,’ such as in the phrase, “his work is very unique.” Here the Greek word would be monadikos, not monogenes. As we examine the New Testament we find the word monogenes used eight times (not counting in usage here in John 1:18). In every case it is used to describe a relationship between a parent and child (Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38; John 1:14; 3:16, 18; Hebrews 11:17; 1 John 4:9). Since this is how the Holy Spirit uses the word in the New Testament, we must accept this definition when reading John 1:18.*

*“The evidence establishes that Jesus Christ, although God (John 1:1), is also the only begotten Son of God. No other can claim hold to this title. Those who accept Christ as their personal Savior are spiritually born of God and are called his Sons (John 1:12). But no human can lay claim to the title of ‘only begotten Son.’ This phrase has not only to do with Christ’s virgin birth, but also his eternal place within the Trinity.*

*“Having established this point, we are now faced with the question of the word following monogenes. Should it be huios (Son) or theos (God)? The oldest known Greek manuscripts that contain John 1:18, P66 and P75, read ‘only begotten God.’ However, these manuscripts all come from the Alexandrian line and smack of ancient Gnosticism. The Gnostics taught that Christ was a begotten god, created by God the Father, whom they call the unbegotten God.”*

Dr Holland has a note elaborating on this Gnostic heresy.

*“The phrase “unbegotten” as applied to God the Father...is found throughout the writings of Gregory of Nyssa in his defence against Gnosticism and Arianism. Therefore, we can conclude that it was a phrase used by Gnostics in their understanding and comparison of the Father with Jesus Christ. Gregory makes the following comment regarding this heresy: “As they [i.e. Gnosticis] say that the Only-begotten God [the Gnostic term for Christ] came into existence ‘later,’ after the Father, this ‘unbegotten’ of theirs, whatever they imagine it to be is discovered of necessity to exhibit with itself the idea of evil.””*

Dr Holland continues.

*“When those who have been tainted with Gnosticism cite John 1:18, they cite it as ‘only begotten God.’ Such is true of Tatian (second century), Valentinus (second century), Clement of Alexandria (215 AD), and Arius (336 AD). On the other hand, we find many of the orthodox fathers who opposed Gnosticism quoting John 1:18 as ‘only begotten Son’ (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Basil, Gregory Nazianzus, and Chrysostom)...”*

*“Professor Bart Ehrman of the University of North Carolina...has noted that he believes the original reading is monogenes huios and not monogenes theos. Although Professor Ehrman did not serve on the [Critical Text] committee, he is a recognized scholar in the field of Biblical textual criticism. Thus not all scholars agree as to the original reading in this regard.”*

Or as Dr Hills has noted<sup>8 p 148</sup>, “*What one scholar grants, another takes away.*” The child of God is better off following the guidance of Billy Sunday<sup>8 p 102</sup>.

*“When the Bible (AV1611) says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go plumb to the Devil!”*

Dr Holland concludes with respect to John 1:18, with an accompanying note.

*“The majority of orthodox church fathers support the reading monogenes huios, as do the majority of existing Greek cursive manuscripts. The reading contained in the majority of uncials (such as A, C (third corrector<sup>9 p 100</sup>), K, W, Θ, Ψ, Δ, Π, Ξ, and 063 [see Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 100</sup> for additional uncial citations], Old Latin, Latin Vulgate, and the Old [Curetonian] Syrian also support the reading monogenes huios.*

*“Since we know the Greek word monogenes concerns the parent/child relationship, and that God is never called monogenes (except for Christ in his relationship to the Father), it is clear that monogenes huios is the correct reading.*

*“My hypothesis is that many of the textual variants were caused by scribal corruption. However, not by orthodox scribes seeking to establish orthodoxy, but by heretical scribes seeking to corrupt Scripture to support their false doctrines. Once we understand that monogenes theos does not mean that Christ is ‘uniquely God,’ but instead would be understood as a ‘begotten god,’ we have a reading that would support the Gnostic reading which proclaimed this very heresy. When we consider those in the second, third, and fourth centuries who support this false reading and the doctrine they held in this regard, it is not far fetched to draw such a conclusion...Namely, that the corruption of the text may be afforded to various heretical groups who sought to move the text of Scripture away from Biblical orthodoxy and toward their heretical position.”*

Dr Holland’s comments clearly put in correct perspective White’s statement “Gregory, the bishop of Nyssa, a staunch defender of the doctrine of the Trinity, knew this reading [“only begotten God”] and found no objection to it [not true – See Dr Holland’s comment above]; rather he utilized it often in his writings as evidence of the glory of Christ.” Like Burgon and Miller, Dr Holland also gives the lie to White’s insistence that “there is no evidence given that Gnostics had anything to do with “changing” the reading at John 1:18.”

White’s<sup>3 p 199, 220</sup> careless use of the term “Yahweh” with respect to “the divine name” once again exposes White’s poor research. White says that, “The divine name “Yahweh,” which in Hebrew is made up of four letters, YHWH...is often badly mispronounced in the popular Anglicized form, Jehovah.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 373ff, 39 p 413ff</sup> decisively refutes White’s poor research with an extensive chapter, from which the following brief extracts are noted, her emphasis. Readers wishing to explore this topic further are strongly urged to obtain Dr Mrs Riplinger’s detailed work, *In Awe of Thy Word*.

*“In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as unbelieving German critics of the Bible were hammering away at the word of God, they tried to refashion God’s name, JEHOVAH. They asserted that the God of Israel’s name should be pronounced Yahweh because, to them, he was nothing more than an offshoot of the pagan deity “Yaho.” Nothing could be further from the truth...Thousands of years ago, perhaps 3,600, the name JEHOVAH was given by God to Moses. It is seen first in Genesis 2:4 in the Hebrew Old Testament and translated in Exodus 6:3 in the KJV. In his scholarly book, A Dissertation Concerning the Antiquity of the Hebrew Language, Letters, Vowel-Points and Accents, John Gill (1697-1771), emi-*

ment theologian and writer, documents the use of the very name JEHOVAH from **before** 200 BC and throughout the centuries of the early church and the following millennium...

*“In summary, ‘JEHOVAH’ and ‘JESUS’ have always sounded and been pronounced exactly as they are today, as ‘JEHOVAH’ and ‘JESUS’...”*

White’s next attack<sup>3 p 201-2, 267-270</sup> is on the AV1611 wording in Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1.

*“Twice the New Testament identifies Jesus Christ by the phrase “Our God and Savior, Jesus Christ,” The first reference is found at Titus 2:13; “looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus” (NASB).....the second reference, 2 Peter 1:1, “Simon Peter, a bond-servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, To those who have received a faith of the same kind as ours, by the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ:”*

*“The NIV and NKJV agree with the NASB in speaking of Christ as our God and Savior. Yet the King James Version is at best ambiguous in its translation of both of these passages:*

*“(Titus 2:13) Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;*

*“(2 Peter 1:1) Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:*

*“The insertion of the second “our” in the AV translation [the second “our” is in Beza’s Greek New Testament – see Dr Holland’s<sup>55 p 192-3</sup> explanation below] makes it possible to separate “God” from “Savior,” as indeed those who deny the deity of Christ would assert...The KJV provides an inferior translation in these passages, one that unintentionally detracts from the presentation of the full deity of Jesus Christ. The willingness of KJV defenders to overlook this fact is most disturbing. Indeed, Barry Burton<sup>149 p 35</sup> provides the following comments on Titus 2:13, and while he attacks the perfectly acceptable translation of the NASB at this point he ignores the inferior translation of the KJV and writes:*

*““LOOK!...LOOK! Here they changed it from the “glorious appearing of Christ to...the appearing of “the glory.” What kind of “glory” are we supposed to look for? If that isn’t CHANGING the WORD of GOD, I don’t know what is!!!”*

*“Such inconsistency is a hallmark of KJV Only materials.”*

Inveterate lying is a hallmark of James White’s material. He adds a note<sup>3 p 220</sup> to the NASV’s “perfectly acceptable translation of” of Titus 2:13. *“The Greek of the passage can be translated either “the appearing of the glory” (the most literal rendering) or “the glorious appearing.”*

Burgon’s<sup>13 p 155</sup> comment on White’s notion of “the most literal rendering” is as follows. See remarks in **Chapter 6**.

*“The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout...We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far.”*

Significantly, White omitted Burton’s final sentence on this verse. *“It’s dangerous to look for a “glory.” The anti-Christ will probably look like a “glory.””* Burton’s conclusion is true. Satan can give “glory.”

**“And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it”** Luke 4:6.

Dr Ruckman comments<sup>16 p 365-7</sup> as follows, his emphases. He includes additional informative comment on John 1:18.

*“The believer should mark this verse [Titus 2:13] well. It was used by the apostate Fundamentalists between 1970 and 1985 to prove that the AV attacked the Deity of Jesus Christ just as much as the RV, ASV, NASV, and NIV had done it. The idea was “the kettle cannot call the pot black.” In books like *The Debate About the Bible and the Battle for the Bible* and *The King James Version Debate*, you will find Titus 2:13 given as a sample to prove that the Authorized Version is just as guilty as the ASV, NASV, NIV, and RV. By reading **“The great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ,”** the AV had unwittingly separated Jesus Christ from God. The “newer translations” – being translated by “godly men” – restored the **Deity of Christ** to the passage – WHILE ATTACKING IT IN LUKE 2:33; ACTS 4:27; 1 TIMOTHY 3:16; AND MATTHEW 12:6!! – by translating “our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ”...while **CREATING TWO GODS IN THE TRINITY** – see John 1:18 in the New ASV!*

*“Let us, as usual, keep our wits...”*

*“1. The figure of speech used here (AV) is so common in the Bible that only a fool would have thought that God and Christ were two **different** persons. The figure is called a “hendiadys” and is so common in the book of Proverbs that a list of the verses would take nearly a page to list. A New Testament example: **“THE HOLY ONE AND THE JUST”** Acts 3:14) is certainly not TWO persons by the widest stretch of anyone’s imagination. See (Num. 24:17.)*

*“2. All new translations maintained the figure (hendiadys) in Ephesians 5:5, and none of them altered the verse to make you think “Christ was God.” **“PURE RELIGION BEFORE GOD AND THE FATHER”** (James 1:27) is certainly not a reference to some “Father” who is not God. In their effort to overthrow the Biblical figure of speech (which is constantly used in Hebrew AND Greek) the modern translators have inserted “our” into James 1:27, which occurs in **NO GREEK TEXT KNOWN TO GOD OR MAN.***

*“3. The figure (hendiadys) means “one by means of two.” The first word (“God”) expresses the thing, and then the second one (in this case, “our Saviour Jesus Christ”) intensifies it by being changed into something else. The figure is ORIENTAL (Hebrew) and is used frequently in both Testaments since Paul is a Hebrew. Note: **“How goodly are THY TENTS, O JACOB, AND THY TABERNACLES, O ISRAEL”** (Num. 24:5).*

*“4. The classic New Testament case is Matthew 21:5, citing Zechariah 9:9, where Christ is pictured as riding TWO animals instead of one. The NASV and NIV simply erased the conjunction (“and”) from both the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts while talking about “older and better” manuscripts.” The Greek word καί (kai) occurs in **ALL manuscripts that have Matthew 21:5.** They also removed the conjunction (and) from **ALL of the Hebrew manuscripts in Daniel 4:13.***

*“5. Observe how the Holy Spirit always takes these gnat-straining nit-pickers and puts them in a “bind” that they can do nothing with. For example: in Revelation 1:4-5 we find **“From HIM WHICH IS, AND WHICH WAS, AND WHICH IS TO COME...AND FROM JESUS CHRIST.”** Is this a reference to two **different** Gods? Does this **subtract** from the Deity of Christ? Well, if it **does**, the ASV, RV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, IV, NASV, and NEB all did the same thing as the AV. They left the text exactly as it stood. This time they*



couldn't subtract anything from the text to suit their theology. The NASV has capitalized the "**him**" in verse 4 to refer to the Deity and then said "**AND from Jesus Christ**" after this. Is this an attack on the Deity of Christ? Of course not. **NEITHER WAS THE AV READING IN TITUS 2:13, WHICH IS THE SAME THING.**

*"(Gave you the shaft again, didn't they? Haven't they always? Yes, they certainly have. They are natural-born liars, and while taken in the very act of **professing** to be magnifying the **Deity of Christ**, they are doing nothing but **attacking the AV text** on irrational grounds by laws which **THEY DO NOT KEEP THEMSELVES.**)"*

*"6. The capstone to this "magnifying the Deity of Christ" in the NIV and NASV (while the AV "downgrades" it in Titus 2:13) is the creating of **TWO SEPARATE GODS** (Jehovah's Witness theology) by the NIV and the NASV in John 1:18. Here, for the ages to behold, the Arian heresy (325 AD) is presented, and in one case **THREE gods are mentioned**. "The only **BEGOTTEN GOD** who is in the bosom of the **FATHER...**" The "**FATHER**" was a reference to **GOD** – "**No man hath seen GOD at any time**" (John 1:18). So here the NASV has given you **two gods**; an unbegotten God called "the Father" and a "begotten God" who was in His bosom.*

*"Two Gods. **Count them**: one, two. (This, after complaining about Titus 2:13 in the AV!)"*

*"The NIV goes one better. It says "**NO one has ever seen GOD**" (first clause). "But God the only Son" (second clause: no "**begetting**," although the word *μονογενης* (*monogenes*) was found in every Greek manuscript extant). "Who is at the **FATHER'S side**" (third clause) "has made him known."*

*"1. God. 2. God the son (never **BEGOTTEN!**). 3. The Father. Someone made known: **who?**"*

*"Now, this is the scholarship of the apostates who put the NIV together. In order to create two gods (as the ASV) they had to write "God the only Son," but being terrified at the thought that the discerning student would see the Jehovah's Witness rendering of a "begotten" God, **THEY SIMPLY ELIMINATED THE GREEK WORD FROM EVERY MANUSCRIPT IN EVERY FAMILY OF MANUSCRIPTS THEY HAD, INCLUDING ALL MANUSCRIPTS AND POPYRUS CALLED "THE OLDEST AND BEST MANUSCRIPTS."***

*"This is twentieth century, Laodicean scholarship at its **best**. Every man involved is "**ORTHODOX.**""*

Like James White.

Dr Ruckman adds<sup>16 p 368-9</sup>, his emphases, "*Not one change needed to be made in Titus 2:13, and when the change was made, they (RV, ASV, NASV, NIV [and NKJV]) got your eyes off of the **Lord Jesus Christ** and onto "his glory"...You may leave Titus 2:13 as it stands in the AV and utterly disregard every twentieth century translation on the market that sought to take your eyes off the appearing of "**the great God**" and focus them on the "GLORY" of His appearing. Someone was trying to sell you a bushel of rotten apples.*"

That "*someone*" includes James White.

The following remarks also apply<sup>8 p 308</sup>, with updated references. See earlier.

3. *Titus 2:13: ALL Greek texts have the wording of the KJV, "God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." None render it as the new versions do.*

4. *2 Peter 1:1 Lewis Foster, NIV and NKJV committee member, reveals WHY new version editors insert Christ's deity in Peter and Titus, yet removed it (in) nearly 100 other places. "Some would point out that in passages Titus and 2 Peter, the expression of the deity of Christ has been strengthened by renderings even in liberal translations. What many do not realize is that even here the strong affirmation of deity is used to serve a purpose. The liberal translator ordinarily denies that Paul wrote Titus or that Peter wrote 2 Peter. He points to the very language deifying Jesus as an indication of the later date of these epistles when Paul and Peter could not have written them."*
5. *2 Thessalonians 1:12, Titus 2:13, and 2 Peter 1:1 are called "hendiades," from the Greek "hen, dia dyoin," 'one by two'. Grammatically it is the "expression of an idea by two nouns connected by "and", instead of by a noun and an adjunct. It would be like introducing one's spouse as "my wife and best friend."*

*"Dr. Ruckman adds <sup>33 p iii</sup> "Any fool could have seen the same construction in Isaiah 45:21."*

*"The AV1611 reading in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 is actually a superior testimony to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ than the NIV variation. "Our God", NIV, simply designates the Lord as God of the Christians. The expression "**God and our Saviour**", AV1611, shows that the Lord is GOD universally but effectually the Saviour of the Christian. Doctrinally, the Lord is, of course, "**Saviour of the world**" John 4:42."*

White then devotes four pages at the end of Part Two of his book to a discussion of "*Granville Sharp's Rule and the KJV*" in order to discredit the AV1611 readings for Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. The essence of his discussion is as follows, his emphasis.

*"The great scholars who labored upon the AV...would have welcomed the study undertaken by Granville Sharp late in the 1790s. Sharp's work resulted in a rule of koine Greek that bears his name, a rule that was not fully understood by the KJV translators. Because of his work, we are able to better understand how plain is the testimony to the deity of Christ that is found in such places as Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. The KJV translators...obscured these passages through less than perfect translation. Modern translations correct their error. And yet, KJV Only advocates continue to defend a rendering that is shared by such Arian translations as the Jehovah's Witnesses' New World Translation, and that solely because of their presupposition that "if it is in the KJV, it **must** be right."*

What White dismisses as "*presupposition*" is proven fact. Not one of his objections to the Text of the AV1611 examined so far has proved valid. And the same will be true for the remainder of his objections. His objection to "*the Jehovah's Witnesses' New World Translation*" is again, at best 'pots and kettles.' It should be remembered that of the 241 passages of scripture where White compares the AV1611 with the NIV, the NIV agrees with the AV1611 in only 9 of those passages, or 4%. The NIV agrees with the NWT in 192 of those passages, or 80%. See **Introduction** and **Appendix, Tables A1-A4**. It is easy to see which version is one of the "*Arian translations*."

White<sup>3 p 198, 258</sup> has of course evaded the Arian reading "*only begotten God*" in John 1:18 in the NASV by shifting to the spurious NIV reading "*God the One and Only*" – see discussion above – and refusing to state the NWT reading for John 1:18 which is "*only-begotten god*," i.e. a match mate to the NASV reading. With the height – or depth – of hypocrisy, White then criticises the NWT as demonstrating "*bias*" because it "*mistrans-*

lates John 1:1 so as to attempt to hide its testimony to Christ's deity." It is clear where the real "bias" lies, with respect to White's comments on "Arian translations."

White continues.

*"Basically, Granville Sharp's rule states that when you have two nouns, which are not proper names...which are describing a person, and the two nouns are connected by the word "and," and the first noun has the article ("the") while the second does not, **both nouns are referring to the same person**. In our texts, this is demonstrated by the words "God" and "Savior" at Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. "God" has the article, it is followed by the word for "and," and the word "Savior" does not have the article. Hence, both nouns are being applied to the same person, Jesus Christ."*

White then argues on the basis of the word order in Greek in 2 Peter 1:11 for "our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ" that the modern alteration in 2 Peter 1:1 is superior to the AV1611 reading because the Greek word order is the same, except for "the substitution of [Lord] for [God]" and he insists that "Consistency in translation demands that we not allow our personal prejudices to interfere with our rendering of God's Word [still undefined]."

White's "personal prejudices" against the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible continue unabated.

Granville Sharp<sup>150, 151</sup> is said to be a classical Greek grammarian but he devoted much of his life to assisting William Wilberforce in his campaign for the abolition of slavery, for which ministry Sharp is chiefly remembered. Although, as White indicates, Sharp proposed his rule supposedly to 'correct' "Passages which are wrongly Translated in the Common English Version," why should anyone believe that his part-time researches exceeded the scholarship of the King James translators? Remember that they included men<sup>8 p 25</sup> like Dr Miles Smith, who "had Hebrew at his fingers' ends" and Dr John Boys who "sometimes devoted himself to his studies of Greek in the university library from 4 a.m. to 8 p.m."

And mainly political activist but partly classical grammarian Granville Sharp is supposed to have understood the biblical languages better than Drs Smith, Boys and their colleagues?

Dean Burgon, whom even White<sup>3 p 91</sup> acknowledges as a true scholar and who lived many years after Granville Sharp, makes no mention of either Sharp or his rule in *The Revision Revised* – even though the RV has the modern readings in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 that White prefers and justifies according to Sharp's rule. It appears therefore that Dean Burgon did not regard Granville Sharp as a classicist of any distinction.

Will Kinney<sup>152</sup> has posted a summary vindication of Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 as they stand in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

*"Titus 2:13*

*"Titus [reads] 2:13 "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of THE GREAT GOD AND OUR SAVIOUR Jesus Christ;" Here the critics say the KJB rendering does not fully bring out the deity of Jesus Christ. I don't really understand what they are talking about, because when I read this passage, it clearly declares that Jesus Christ is the great God as well as our Saviour.*

*"The NKJV, NIV and NASB all join here in rendering this verse as "the appearing of OUR great God and Savior Jesus Christ." They apparently think this brings out his deity*

more clearly. However, it is necessary to point out two very important things in this verse. Number one is that the Greek reads exactly as it stands in the KJB, and not as it is in the NKJV, NIV and NASB.

*“The Greek in all texts reads “the great God and OUR Saviour.” The second thing to point out is the difference in meaning. You see, when Christ appears again in glory, He is the God of everybody - every man, woman and child, believer or unbeliever - but He is OUR Saviour. He is the Saviour of only those who are true Christians, but He is the God and creator of all, and He will be the judge of those who have not believed on Him.*

*“So the KJB is actually more accurate here than the NIV, NKJV and NASB. Other versions that read as does the KJB are the ASV, Webster’s Bible, J. B. Phillips, Tyndale 1525, Wycliffe’s 1380, Cranmer’s Bible 1539, Rheims 1582, Coverdale 1535, Bishop’s 1568, Geneva Bible 1599, Lamsa of 1933, the Spanish Reina Valera of 1909, the Italian Diodati and the Third Millennium Bible”...*

*“2 Peter 1:1 [reads] “To them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”*

*“Again they say the verse, as it stands in the KJB, does not clearly show the deity of Jesus Christ. The NKJV, NIV and NASB read: “through the righteousness of OUR God and Savior, Jesus Christ.”*

*“First, it needs to be pointed out that there are several textual differences in the Greek of verses one and two. One of the “oldest and best” manuscripts called Sinaiticus reads “Lord” or kurios instead of God. But the NASB and NIV didn’t follow this, but rather the majority reading of “God”.*

*“In the next verse we read: “Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge OF GOD AND OF JESUS OUR LORD.”*

*“Here several texts omit “of God and of Jesus” - The Expositor’s Greek Testament does this. Other texts omit “of God”, and Sinaiticus adds the word CHRIST to Jesus, and others substitute the word “Saviour” instead of “Lord”. So there is a wide variety of different readings for these first two verses.*

*“Secondly, in the texts followed by the KJB, Beza’s of 1589 and 1598, as well as Elzevirs, there is an additional “our” found before Jesus Christ. Regardless of these textual differences, the verse in question can either serve as a proof text for Christ’s deity or not, depending on how you choose to read it.*

*“The reading as it stands in the KJB “the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” can easily be seen as stating that He is both God and our Saviour. Compare other verses with similar wording. In Isaiah 44:6, 24 we are told “Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, AND his redeemer the LORD of hosts: I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God...Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, AND he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD that maketh all things...” Even though there is the word “and” in between the two nouns, we know there is only one person who is being referred to - God.*

*“The same thing is found in 1 Thessalonians 3:11 “Now God himself AND our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you.”; Galatians 1:4 “according to the will of God AND our Father.” The “and” is not implying another person, but is bringing out another aspect of the same one. He is both God and our Father.*

*“So too, in 2 Peter the “God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” can be seen as showing another aspect of the same divine Person, just as 2 Peter 1:11 “kingdom of our Lord AND Saviour Jesus Christ.”*

*“Even the reading of the NKJV, NIV and NASB could be looked upon as describing two distinct persons; it all depends on how one reads it.*

*““Righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ”, can be compared to statements like “our Mom and Dad won’t let us go to the party” or “our boss and manager will be at the meeting”.*

*“In Scripture we have “ye are our glory and joy” 1 Thessalonians 2:20, and Acts 15:25 “our beloved Barnabas and Paul”. Both Barnabas and Paul were beloved but they obviously were two different people. You see, if you wish to see a declaration of Christ’s deity in this verse, it is there. Likewise, it can be explained away by those who do not wish to see it in either rendering. The Jehovah Witness New World Translation reads much the same way as the NKJV, NIV, NASB, and yet they manage to explain away the full deity of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

*“The King James Bible is in no way inferior to the other versions. Other Bible versions that read just like the King James Bible in 2 Peter 1:1 are the Italian Diodati (dell’ Iddio e Salvator nostro, Gesu Cristo), written before the KJB of 1611, Webster’s 1833 Bible translation, the 21st Century KJB, Green’s Modern King James Version, and the Third Millennium Bible. Other versions like J. P. Green’s 1998 Modern KJV, Moffat’s translation and the 1602 Geneva bible read: “through the righteousness of our God and our Savior Jesus Christ”*

*“Dr. Thomas Holland has written a very good article refuting James White’s groundless criticism of the King James Bible...He addresses Titus 2:13 and the others about two-thirds down in his article here: [www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/lesson12.htm](http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/lesson12.htm).”*

It is noted that the bibles of Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all read “our God and Saviour” against the AV1611’s “**God and our Saviour**” in 2 Peter 1:1. This level of departure from the AV1611 is exceptional but no doubt illustrates in part why the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible eventually superseded these earlier versions. The Lord oversaw the necessary refinement to these versions in a little over two centuries and the Text of the Holy Bible, AV1611, has been stabilised for the four centuries since then.

But the readings of the earlier bibles give the lie to White’s notion that “*The great scholars who labored upon the AV...would have welcomed the study undertaken by Granville Sharp late in the 1790s. Sharp’s work resulted in a rule of koine Greek that bears his name, a rule that was not fully understood by the KJV translators.*”

The King’s men clearly did understand the ‘rule’ to which White alludes and clearly understood it better than either White or Sharp, because they achieved a superior translation of the underlying Greek expression, one that, as has been noted, God has honoured for the last 400 years.

Extracts from Dr Holland’s article will be viewed following those from his book<sup>55</sup> p 188-190,<sup>192-4</sup> that address Sharp’s rule, his emphases.

*“It is argued e.g. [by James White] that the KJV incorrectly translated [Titus 2:13] and violated the Granville Sharp Rule of Greek grammar. Basically this rule states that the two nouns (God and Savior) refer to the same Person, Jesus Christ. They are correct in their understanding of this grammatical rule. They are incorrect in stating that the Authorized Version has violated it.*

*“The problem is not with the KJV, but rather a lack of understanding English grammar. In English, when two nouns are separated by the phrase ‘and our,’ the context determines if the nouns refer to two persons or to two aspects of the same person. Consider the following sentence, “He was a great hero and our first president, General George Washington.” This statement is not referring to two persons but two aspects of the same person. Washington was a great hero by everyone’s standards, but he was not everyone’s president. He was **our president**.*

*“The same is true of the phrase in Titus 2:13. When Christ returns he is coming as King of kings and Lord of lords (Revelation 19:16). He is returning as **the great God** (Titus 2:13, Revelation 19:17). Therefore, he will return as everyone’s King, everyone’s Lord, as **the great God** over all. But he is not everyone’s Savior. He is only the Savior of those who have placed faith in him. When he returns he is coming as **the great God** but he is also returning as **our Savior**, two aspects of the same Person.*

*“This is illustrated elsewhere in Scripture. Consider the following two passages in the New Testament. In both cases two nouns are separated by the phrase ‘and our.’ However, it is also clear that the two nouns refer to the same Person: God, who is our Father. In Galatians 1:4 we read, “Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father.” Likewise, in 1 Thessalonians 1:3 we read, “Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father.” In both passages we know that ‘God’ and ‘Father’ are the same Person. They are separated by ‘and our’ to convey the truth that the Eternal God over all is also our Father, thereby personalising our relationship with Him.*

*“The King James translation of Titus 2:13 is also consistent. In the Book of Titus we find the Greek phrase soteris emon (Savior of us) used six times (1:3, 4; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6). Each time the Authorized Version consistently translates it as ‘our Savior.’ In the final analysis, we see that the KJV is harmonious in its use of Greek as well as in its proclamation of the deity of Christ...*

*“The Authorized Version has been accused [by James White and Bruce Metzger] of inconsistency in its translation of 2 Peter 1:1 when compared with its translation of 2 Peter 1:11. In the later passage we read, “For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of **our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ**.” In making such an accusation, some have provided the following comparison between 2 Peter 1:1 and 2 Peter 1:11.*

*“1:1: tou theou emon kai soteris Iesou Christou*

*“1:11: tou kuriou emon kai soteris Iesou Christou*

*“It is then noted that the only difference between the two verses is the substitution of kuriou (Lord) in verse eleven instead of theou (God) as found in verse one. Therefore according to the Greek, verse one must be translated as “our God and Savior” in order to be consistent. Since the KJV does not do this, it is looked upon as mistranslating this passage.*

*“The point... would be correct if the Greek text that underlies the KJV read as presented. However, it does not. The Greek text used by the King James translators was Beza’s text of 1589 and 1598. There we find an additional *emon* (our) at 2 Peter 1:1 that is not provided by those who call this a mistranslation. The two are compared below with Beza’s text presented first.*

*“Tou theou *emon kai soteris* *emon Iesou Christou**

*“Tou theou *emon kai soteris* *Iesou Christou**

*“The translation of Beza’s text is correct in the Authorized Version, and is consistent since the additional *emon* appears in 2 Peter 1:1 and not 2 Peter 1:11.*

*“The question exists why Beza provided the additional *emon* at 2 Peter 1:1 that is not found in the other Greek texts. Dr Bruce Metzger may supply the answer. Although not discussing this passage, Dr Metzger does note the following concerning Beza: “Accompanied by annotations and his own Latin version, as well as Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, these editions (of Beza’s text from 1565, 1582, 1589, and 1598) contained a certain amount of textual information drawn from several Greek manuscripts which Beza had collated himself, as well as the Greek manuscripts collated by Henry Stephanus, son of Robert Stephanus.”*

*“Since the Greek text of Robert Stephanus did not contain the addition, and the Greek text of Beza does, it is logical to assume that Beza added the *emon* at 2 Peter 1:1 based on various manuscripts that he possessed (or the ones possessed by Henry Stephanus). We would be mistaken to presume that all existing manuscripts used in the sixteenth century are still in existence today. Some have undoubtedly passed away over time. Regardless, the inclusion of the extra *emon* in this passage provides evidence of its preservation. It is certainly not a mistranslation on the part of the KJV.”*

Dr Holland concludes, his emphasis, with an admonition that precisely sums up James White’s attitude to the scriptures – and his entire book.

*“We would do well to take note and exercise caution when seeking to correct what we **perceive** is a mistranslation. It just may be that the one in error is the one passing judgment.”*

Extracts from Dr Holland’s article<sup>153</sup> follow. They develop various aspects of the explanation from his book. The underlinings are his.

*“According to James White both of these passages have been mistranslated in the KJV because of the translators lack of knowing the Grandville Sharpe Rule. The rule as cited by White reads as follows:*

*““When the copulative *kai* connects two nouns of the same case if the article *o*, or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the later always relates to the same person that is expressed or described by the first noun or participle: i.e. it denotes a farther description of the first named person.”*

*“It should be noticed that the Grandville Sharpe Rule does not state where the personal pronoun “our” is to be placed. Nor does it allow for the removal of the definite article “the” as we find the NIV doing in Titus 2:13. The grammatical argument is further weakened because of the Greek phrase “our Saviour” (Gk: *soteris emon*). This phrase is used six times in the epistle of Titus (1:3, 4; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6). The KJV correctly translates this phrase all six times as “our Saviour.” The NIV translates the phrase as “our*

Savior” five of the six times, leaving only Titus 2:13 to stand out as an inconsistent usage of the Greek phrase.

“The phrase, “ great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ,” does not denote two personages. Instead, the phrase indicates two aspects of the same person and is a proper point in English grammar. When Christ returns, which is the context of the verse, He will come as the King of kings and Lord of lords (Revelation 19:16), the Mighty God (Isaiah 9:6). [Whether] the world is ready or not, He is coming as everyone’s God; but He is our Saviour. The phrase provides a general statement about Christ and His deity as well as His personal relationship with the saints.

“This is seen elsewhere in Scripture as well. Notice how the personal pronoun “ our” is used in the following verse, “ Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:” (Galatians 1:4, also see 1 Thess. 1:3; 3:11). Notice that the phrase “ the will of God and our Father” refers to the same person, God the Father. The same construction can be seen in other verses as well. In 1 Thess. 1:3 we read, “in the sight of God and our Father.” Also, in 1 Thess. 3:11 the passage states, “Now God himself and our Father,” both verses show the “and our” refer to the very same person. In these cases, to God the Father.

“This is a point of English grammar. For example, we could say, He was a great war hero and our nation’s first President, George Washington.” Both the phrase “great war hero” and “our nation’s first President” refer to the same person. So it is with the passages in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1.

“The King James Bible is further attacked by James White concerning Titus 2:13 as he makes the following claim in his book.

““And yet, KJV Only advocates continue to defend a rendering that is shared by such Arian translations as the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ New World Translation, and that solely because of their presupposition that “ if it is in the KJV, it must be right.””

“This statement simply is untrue. The reading of the KJV and the NWT are not alike at all. One can see by examining the two translations together that the NWT does violate the Grandville Sharpe Rule by making the verse refer to two personages. Further, the NWT adds the genitive of and the article the before the Saviour.

““Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ.” – KJV. “While we wait for the happy hope and glorious manifestation of the great God and of [the] Savior of us, Christ Jesus.” NWT.”

White continues to deceive and denigrate the Lord Jesus Christ as God.

He<sup>3</sup> p 202-3, p 263 now accuses the AV1611 of omitting “me” in John 14:14 and thus detracting from the Lord’s Deity. He states, his emphases. “Jesus speaks of His disciples’ communication with Him, even after He has risen to heaven. “If you ask **Me** anything in My name, I will do it”...as prayer is something that is reserved for deity alone, this passage is important in demonstrating another aspect of the deity of Christ.

“The inclusion of the term “Me” in John 14:14 is based upon being present in a large proportion of manuscripts, including the oldest manuscripts of the Gospel of John. Yet the KJV lacks the term, following only one portion of the Majority Text.”

White then concocts a chart, comparing the AV1611 and the NWT, which also omits “Me” in John 14:14 with the Westcott and Hort Text and the NASV, both of which in-



clude “*Me*” in John 14:14, as does the NIV. See **Appendix, Table A1**. In a thinly veiled attempt to slur Dr Mrs Riplinger, he uses this contrivance “to illustrate how easy it is to create “conspiracies” out of partial information” because “If someone were intent upon alleging that the King James Version...is somehow in collusion with such groups as the Jehovah’s Witnesses, and that, in fact, the modern texts are the “true” texts to the exclusion of the KJV, one could produce the following kind of chart.”

White then ‘disproves’ the supposed ‘conspiracy’ “because there is no evidence of such collaboration between the KJV and the NWT. **The mere fact of having the same reading proves nothing at all...**Even so, the above chart should look familiar to anyone who has read KJV Only materials, as it presents the very same kind of argument that fills page after page of their books, only this time it is presented in reverse! Since the same argument works both ways, we see that the KJV Only position is inconsistent when it utilizes this kind of polemic.”

White<sup>3 p 263</sup> has an additional note with respect to manuscript evidence for and against the inclusion of “*Me*” in John 14:14. Using the United Bible Societies 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Greek New Testament, he lists as including  $\mu\epsilon$  (“*Me*”) P66, P75,  $\aleph$ , B, W,  $\Delta$ ,  $\Theta$ , Family 13, 7 cursives, including Ms 33<sup>9 p 27</sup>, the vacillating “queen of the cursives” and part of the ‘Byzantine’ stream of manuscripts. Those that omit  $\mu\epsilon$  (“*Me*”), White lists as A, D, L,  $\Psi$ , up to 9 cursives and the remainder of the ‘Byzantine’ stream containing John 14. White also quotes Metzger’s justification for the insertion of “*Me*” into John 14:14.

““Either the unusual collocation, “ask *me* in *my* name”...or a desire to avoid contradiction with 16:23, seems to have prompted...the omission of  $\mu\epsilon$  in a variety of witnesses (A D K L II  $\Psi$  Byz *al*)...The word is adequately supported (P66  $\aleph$  B W  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  Family 13 28 33 700 *al*) and seems to be appropriate in view of its correlation with  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  [personal pronoun “*I*”] later in the verse.””

The term “*al*” refers to “*some*” manuscripts<sup>9 p 59</sup>.

As usual, it is White who has divulged only “*partial information*.”

He refers to one reading in order to demonstrate a bogus ‘conspiracy’ and vehemently insists that “**The mere fact of having the same reading proves nothing at all.**” He then unwittingly invalidates his own ‘demonstration’ by referring to “page after page” of such charts in “*KJV Only materials*” i.e. *New Age Versions* by Dr Mrs Riplinger. “Page after page” of such charts must contain much more than just one specially selected reading. Such is indeed the case, which has been mentioned before in this work. Note the statement in the **Introduction** and in **Chapter 3 – “Starting at the Beginning.”**

White levels criticisms at 241 passages of scripture as they stand in the AV1611, 252 verses in total, of which 24 verses are from the Old Testament. Of that selection, the NIV stands with the AV1611 in only 9 of the 241 passages, or in 4% of the total. However, it lines up against the AV1611 with the JR, DR, JB and NWT in 28% of the passages, with the JB and NWT in 70% of the passages and with one or more of the JR, DR, JB, NWT in 89% of the passages that White mentions.

As it happens, the NIV and the NASV agree with the Jesuit Douay Rheims Bible in John 14:14, although not with the JB or NWT. See **Appendix, Table A1**. Proof of ‘conspiracy,’ however, is not dependent on one verse comparison only. It is furnished by White’s own scripture citations, with respect to the 215 passages of the 241 that he quotes for comparison of the modern versions with the AV1611 that agree with Rome, Watchtower or both *against* the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, or 89%.

The bibles of Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops'<sup>138</sup> all read with the AV1611 in John 14:14, showing that the AV1611 reading was established as the correct reading long before it appeared as such in the AV1611. Of the Greek editors before Westcott and Hort, only Tischendorf<sup>62</sup> unequivocally supports the insertion of "Me" while Lachmann thinks it may be possible, so Metzger, White, Westcott and Hort have little support from those that went before them.

Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 138-141</sup> refers to John 14:14 as one of approximately 30 "alterations indicated by the Revisionists... 'positively required by change of reading in the Greek Text.'" Burgon says of these alterations, including the insertion of "Me" in John 14:14, "These then are a handful of the less conspicuous instances of a change in the English 'positively required by a change of reading in the Greek Text:' every one of them being either a pitiful blunder or else a gross fabrication... The A.V. is better in every instance."

Will Kinney<sup>154</sup> has written an informative article entitled *Does John 14:14 in the King James Bible deny the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ?* He states.

*"There are some Bible correctors who ignorantly assert that the reading of the King James Bible in John 14:14 denies or obscures the deity of Christ.*

*"Let's look at the evidence. In the King James Bible we read: "If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it." This is the reading of the Majority of all remaining Greek texts, including A (Alexandrinus), and D, along with the Greek Lectionaries, many Old Latin copies, the Coptic Boharic and Sahidic, Ethiopian and Slavonic ancient versions.*

*"However, primarily based on Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, many but not all modern versions add the extra word "me" to the text, and so the NASB reads: "If you ask Me anything in My name, I will do it.", while the NIV has: "You may ask me for anything in my name, and I will do it."*

*"Those who criticize the reading found in the KJB say that the new versions show the believers asking Jesus directly and so show His deity, while the KJB does not. This is obviously an unsound argument. In the KJB and Majority of all texts, we have Christ saying "If ye ask anything in my name, I WILL DO IT." If Christ Himself ANSWERS PRAYER then He is God!*

*"Not only do the NKJV, Tyndale, Geneva Bible, Young's, Spanish Reina Valera, Luther's German bible and others based on the Traditional Text read as does the King James Bible, but so also do many other modern versions that are even based primarily on the Westcott-Hort text."*

Why do neither White nor Metzger mention the evidence of the ancient versions in support of the AV1611 reading? Is it because this evidence would decidedly tip the balance of manuscript testimony in favour of the AV1611, if the Greek witnesses are as evenly divided as White and Metzger would have their readers believe?

Among these modern versions, Kinney lists the ASV, the 'old' American Standard Version<sup>155</sup>, as omitting "Me" in John 14:14. Why did the editors of the 'new' American Standard Version introduce the change? Was it for reasons of copyright? Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>156</sup> writes, her underlinings.

*"The derivative copyright law insists that: "To be copyrightable, a derivative work [e.g. the NASV] must be different enough from the original [e.g. the ASV] to be regarded as a 'new work' or must contain a substantial amount of new material. Making minor changes or additions of little substance to a pre-existing work will not qualify the work as a new version for copyright purposes."*

Kinney states further that Sinaiticus  $\aleph$  (White's<sup>3 p 33</sup> "great treasure") and Vaticanus B ("another great codex" such that  $\aleph$  and B<sup>3 p 169</sup> "carry a great deal of weight") repeatedly conflict with each other throughout John 14. He describes in particular how these manuscripts conflict in verses 2, 5, 7 (5 times), 9 (twice), 10 (4 times), 11, 14, 15, 16, 17 and adds "We could easily continue through the rest of this single chapter demonstrating the same disagreements between "the oldest and best" not only with the Majority of all Greek texts but also with each other."

Kinney's findings support those of Dean Burgon with respect to  $\aleph$  and B. See remarks under **The Revision Conspiracy** on Burgon's analyses of the Lord's Prayer in Luke 11:2, 4 and Mark 2:1-12. Kinney states of John 14:14, "Even here where Sinaiticus and Vaticanus both add the extra word "me", which started this whole discussion, they both disagree with each other. For the phrase "I will do it", Vaticanus reads: "touto poieesoo" (I will do it), while Sinaiticus has: "ego poieesoo" (I, I will do)."

Kinney reveals further that the NIV follows Sinaiticus – and the AV1611 – in verse 5 in retaining the word "**and**" but Vaticanus and the NASV omit this word. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus have "his works," which reading the NASV follows, instead of "**the works**" in verse 10 but the NIV reads "who is doing his work." The AV1611 has "me" in verse 11 but Sinaiticus, the NASV and NIV omit it. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus omit the second "**him**" in verse 17 but the NASV and NIV retain it.

Neither White nor Metzger seem prepared to address these glaring anomalies.

Clearly, as even this small sample shows, the NASV and NIV are not 'consistent' translations, except insofar as they are consistently corrupt where they depart from the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

Kinney rightly concludes.

*"To sum up, in the first place John 14:14 as it stands in the King James Bible in no way detracts from the full deity of Christ. If He answers prayer, "I will do it", then He is God. Secondly, if you are trusting in many modern versions that rely primarily on Sinaiticus and Vaticanus you have a corrupt bible version that does not represent the true words of the living God. It is that simple."*

White<sup>3 p 203-4, 220-1</sup>, resumes his attack on the Holy Bible with respect to the word "**Godhead**" in Colossians 2:9.

*"The KJV rendering of this passage is probably the least clear of almost all currently available translations. How does one explain what "Godhead" means? Who really uses this term any longer? And what about the fact that the KJV uses "godhead" in other places when it is translating a completely different Greek term?"*

*"The term translated "deity" by the NASB and NIV is a Greek term that is nowhere else used in the New Testament. It is a very strong affirmation of the deity of Christ. The KJV, by using a term that it uses elsewhere in translating other words that are not as strong as the term here, unintentionally obscures the meaning of the apostle."*

White then inserts a chart, or table, listing Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20 and Colossians 2:9 that contain the words  $\theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$ ,  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$  respectively, each of which White states is translated "**the Godhead**" in the AV1611 but as "the Divine Nature," "divine nature" and "Deity" respectively in the NASV, according to White. The NIV has "divine being" in Acts 17:29 but reads with the NASV in Romans 1:20 and Colossians 2:9. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

White continues, his emphasis.

*“Modern translations correctly recognize the differences in meaning between the three Greek terms...A person using the RSV or NIV or NASB will be in a better position to explain these passages than one utilizing **only** the KJV. Such is hardly consistent with the charges that are part and parcel of KJV Only writings.”*

White later inserts a note on the term *theotes*, *θεοτης* as found in Colossians 2:9 as follows.

*“[This] Greek term...must be differentiated from a different term, *theiotes* (θειοτης), which is found at Romans 1:20. Richard C. Trench wrote regarding these two terms in his *Synonyms of the New Testament*... “...there is a real distinction between them and one which grounds itself on their different derivations; *θεοτης* (*theotes*) being derived from *θεος* (*theos*), and *θειοτης* (*theiotes*), not from *το θειον*, (*to theion*), which is nearly though not quite equivalent to *θεος* (*theos*), but from the adjective *θειος* (*theios*)...But in the second passage (Col. ii.9) St Paul is declaring that in the Son there dwells all the fullness of the absolute Godhead; they were no mere rays of divine glory which gilded Him...He was, and is, absolute and perfect God; and the Apostle uses *θεοτης* (*theotes*) to express the essential and personal Godhead of the Son...”*

Then why is the AV1611 supposedly at fault for using the word **“Godhead”** in Colossians 2:9, which word is stronger than the word **“Deity”** because it implies the fullness of the *triune* Godhead? White gives no explanation.

White’s comparison between different versions may usefully be answered by means of a second chart, more accurately table.

**Table 1**  
**Comparison of English Bibles with respect to the Term “Godhead”**  
 Spelling as in the AV1611, except where wording differs

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Acts 17:29	<i>godly thing</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<b><i>Godhead</i></b>
Romans 1:20	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<b><i>Godhead</i></b>
Colossians 2:9	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<b><i>Godhead</i></b>

By and large, the translators whom God used to prepare and implement the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation disagree with White and Trench, whom God has not used to bring in any Reformation in any century.

As indicated repeatedly in this work, these faithful precursors to the AV1611 exhibit the God-honoured text down through the centuries, just as the AV1611 represents the God-honoured since its publication.

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 257-8</sup> has these comments, his emphases.

““Godhead” (Acts 17:29; Col. 2:9; and Rom. 1:20). Here, Jimbo tells us that a person who uses an RSV or NRSV or an NIV or a NASV, “will be in a better position to explain these passages than one UTILIZING [Scholarship Only advocates BELIEVE nothing: they “utilize” translations] only the KJV.”

**“Well, we’re waiting.** Where is the explanation? If you and your buddies are “in a better position” to explain something, for heaven’s sake “share with us” your “vast better understanding of the Scriptures!” **Well?** Is this dude telling you that more than seventy men on four committees (RSV, NRSV, NIV, and NASV) could not produce even TWO “explanations” for the **“Godhead”** in the three verses cited from the AV (1611)? You call that “evidence?” You never got a more irresponsible, wild, irrational, **lying assertion** in all your life. **Lying** is as natural to a Scholarship Only advocate as scratching his head: they make their living (\$\$\$) by lying.

“With 14,000,000 suckers using NIVs and NASVs, not one of them produced four pages on those three verses, so that any other sucker would get a “better understanding” of the Godhead (the Trinity). What was the point in **altering** the God-honoured texts when you didn’t **believe** them to start with, couldn’t **improve** on them by **changing them**, and then couldn’t exegete **your own TEXT** after you **altered it**? Why these creeps would alter the “original, verbally inspired autographs” the moment they got their hands on them, if they ever did get their hands on them: they think they are **gods**. By the way, the NASV did NOT translate the three words (Acts 17; Col. 2; Rom. 1) in question three different ways. Jimmy lied again. The NASV translated “Theios” (θειος) and “Theiotos” (θειοτης) as “DIVINE NATURE.” The “article” had nothing to do with the translation of the Greek words at all...The NIV and the NASV (and the men who recommend them) are about as trustworthy as Jehudi (Jer. 36).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 5</sup> has this response to White’s criticisms of the term **“Godhead,”** her emphases. Note that she is referring to an earlier, newsletter publication of White’s, where he alludes to the work of Thayer. It was via earlier publications such as this that he initially attacked Dr Mrs Riplinger and her book *New Age Versions*, prompting her response<sup>7</sup> to White that was first published in book form as *The King James Version Ditches Blind Guides*, of whom White is one. White<sup>3 p 123</sup> makes passing reference to this

work and he most likely deleted the reference to Thayer's lexicon in the light of Dr Mrs Riplinger's scathing denunciation of this source and its writer, which follows. See also her detailed warnings<sup>114</sup> about contemporary lexicons in *Chapters 4, 5*.

However, White retains Thayer's lexical definitions for the Greek words translated as "**Godhead**" in the AV1611 and the reference to Trench, because Dr Mrs Riplinger makes only a brief, though damning reference to Trench in *Blind Guides*, p 48-9. More details may be found earlier<sup>114</sup>, in *Chapters 4, 5*.

*"His Greek lexicon library comes from the enemy camp. He must be totally unaware that the lexicon he uses, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, was written by a UNITARIAN. Thayer spent his entire life trying to prove that the Trinity does not exist and that Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost are not God.*

*"So, where does Mr. White go to prove that my defence of the KJV's "Godhead" (Rom. 1:20, Col. 2:9, Acts 17:29) is wrong? You guessed it: Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon!! The publisher's preface even gives a warning cautioning readers to be alert regarding alterations and verses dealing with the deity of Christ. There are four very strong verses on the Trinity in the KJV. Thayer manages to dissolve all of them. White follows this blind leader of the blind and says,*

*"Thayer's lexicon says 'deity...theotes, theiotes: theot'. Deity differs from 'theiot'. Divinity, as essence differs from quality or attribute. This bit of information is vital" (Pros Apoligian, Vol. 2, Issue 2)"*

*"To defend the new version's dismissal of "the Godhead," White parrots Thayer saying, "theiotes means divinity or divine nature just as the NASB renders it. [T]heotes...means deity."*

*"Sorry, Mr. Thayer and Mr. White, the root theos means G-O-D, no matter how deftly a non-Trinitarian like Thayer tries to divest the powerful term 'Godhead' of its Trinitarian meaning. Most lexicons used to **correct** the KJV were written by unsaved liberal scholars. (White also cites Trench's Synonyms to correct the KJV; Trench was a turn-of-the-century liberal.)...*

*"When a word has **two** or more potential meanings, the new versions always use this as an opportunity to 1.) elevate man and 2.) demote Jesus or God. White will pretend to his readers that the lexical evidence supports only his word choice, always the liberal one - **Abridged** bookstore lexicons and one word Greek definitions given in Strong's Concordance DO NOT represent the **varieties** of potential word meanings given in **real** research lexicons (i.e. the **ten volume** Theological Dictionary of the New Testament). Both the pagan **and** Judeo Christian semantic tradition are presented in such **unabridged** works. Recent **bookstore** brand lexicons present only the **recent** liberal trend to choose their definitions from the PAGAN tradition.*

*"In the legal world, when liberals could not change the **laws**, they altered Black's Law Dictionary instead, giving broader and more liberal definitions for words. A parallel move has taken place in the 'dictionaries' used by 'Christians'. Those ministers, students or professors who say, "The word **should** have been translated...", (based on a brief citation in a lexicon) are echoing the serpent's 'hath God said?'. They are trusting the interpretation of one or two men, who probably are not born again Christians and about whom they know **NOTHING**. The scriptures are of **no** "private interpretation" (II Peter 1:20). The entire body of Christ replaced the O.T. priesthood and took over its job to guard the scripture. The Bible (KJV) has been approved after being subjected to the scrutiny of believers for hundreds of years. Cults always move the authority **away** from*

*the Bible itself. Neither the definitions in interlinears (NASB, NIV, Berry's, Green's, Kohlenberger's, et al.) or the definitions in concordances (Strong's, Young's, et al.) or definitions in lexicons by Bauer, Bullinger, Earle, Gingrich, Kubo, Liddell-Scott, Louw-Nida, Mounce, Perschbacher, Thayer, Vincent, Wigram, Wuest, Brown, Driver and Briggs, Gesenius, Davidson or Holladay can or should be transplanted to replace the correct equivalencies God has instilled into the Bible.*

*"The historic doctrine of 'providential preservation' is being replaced by the notion of 'provisional restoration'. They are moving the locus of inspiration away from the Bible you hold in your hand to some 'lost originals'. God did not promise inaccurate translations and lost originals. An inerrant, but inaccessible, word of God is of no value. Why wouldn't the world laugh at those who profess **infallible** truth from a **fallible** book? Authority is based on infallibility which is based on inspiration. The ultimate question and the first question (Gen. 3) is **who** is the authority - God and his word or man and his ideas?"*

Will Kinney<sup>157</sup> also decisively refutes White's objections to the word "**Godhead**." His last paragraph is an excellent comment on the mentality of bible correctors such as James White and 'our critic'<sup>8</sup>.

Kinney also has some most informative comments on how "**Godhead**" indicates the Trinity, whereas "**Deity**" does not.

*"Godhead or Deity - Is James White Right?"*

*"Colossians 2:8-9*

*"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of THE GODHEAD bodily."*

*"James White, a well known King James Bible critic, ignorantly harangues against the use of the word Godhead in the KJB. In his book, The King James Only Controversy, when discussing Colossians 2:9 Mr. White says on page 204: "Yet, the KJV rendering of this verse is probably the least clear of almost all currently available translations. How does one explain what "Godhead" means? Who really uses this term any longer? And what about the fact that the KJV uses "godhead" in other places when it is translating a completely different Greek term?"*

*"Then Mr. White has a chart which shows the NASB rendering of the three passages where the KJB has Godhead in all three. Here are the NASB renderings: Acts 17:29 the Divine Nature (Theios); Romans 1:20 divine nature (theiotes), and Colossians 2:9 Deity (theotes).*

*"As for Mr. White's puzzlement about how one explains what Godhead means, he might try looking at any number of current English dictionaries. Actually the word Godhead is much stronger and more accurate than the "deity" of the NASB, NIV and ESV.*

**"GODHEAD**

*"Merriam Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary 1967, " the nature of God especially as existing in three persons -- used with the".*

*"The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition. 2000.1. Divinity; godhood. 2. Godhead The Christian God, especially the Trinity.*

*“The Greek lexicons of both Kittel and Thayer’s also show Godhead as being one of the primary meanings of this Greek word used in Colossians 2:9. [White must have picked the ‘liberal’ definition – see Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments above.]*

*“The word Godhead implies the Three Persons of the Trinity, whereas the simple word Deity does not. There are many deities but only one Godhead. It is more than just coincidence that the KJB has the word Godhead three times in the New Testament.*

*“As for Mr. White’s charge that all three Greek words are “completely different”, please note that all three have the base word Theos, which by itself means God. Not only does the KJB translate all three instances of these related words as Godhead, but so also do Tyndale 1525, Miles Coverdale 1535, Bishop’s Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, Webster’s 1833 translation, Young’s “literal” translation, the KJV 21st Century Version, and the Third Millennium Version.*

*“Mr. White complains about the translation of Godhead here in Colossians 2:9, yet the NKJV, which he recommends in his book as a reliable translation, also has Godhead in Colossians 2:9. Not only do all nine translations just mentioned have Godhead in Colossians 2:9, but so also do Lamsa’s 1960 translation of the Syriac Peshitta, the Revised Version, American Standard Version, Darby, New English Bible 1961, Wycliffe, Hebrew Names Version, the World English Bible, Douay-Rheims, Amplified, Green’s Modern KJV, and Rotherham’s Emphatic Bible. That is a total of at least 21 English bible versions that disagree with Mr. White’s “scholarly” opinions.*

*“As for Mr. White’s question, “Who really uses this term any longer?”, I suggest he get on the internet or read any number of current magazines or books. He will soon learn that it is still a very common word used especially when discussing the Trinity.*

*“I have also heard radio preachers today who use the modern versions talking about the Godhead, little realizing that this word no longer appears in the bible versions they use.*

*“Mr. White also shows his hypocrisy when he says the KJB translates three “completely” different words as Godhead. The NASB, for whom he now works, has two very different words translated as deity - daimonion in Acts 17:18 and theotes in Colossians 2:9 - and another five very different words translated as Divine. In Acts 17:29 theios is translated as “divine nature”, in Romans 1:20 theiotes is “divine nature”, in Romans 11:4 kreematismos is translated as “divine response”, in 2 Corinthians thew is translated as “divinely”, and in Hebrews 9:1 latreia is translated as “divine service”.*

*“The word Godhead in orthodox Christian theology clearly implies the Trinity. If anyone studies their Bible, you know that Christ was God manifest in the flesh (1 Timothy 3:16 in the KJB, but not the NASB, ESV, RSV, NIV). The Lord also said in John 14:10 “Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?...the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.”*

*“The Lord Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost (Luke 1:35) and God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power (Acts 10:38). In Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*

*“People like James White have no inspired Bible or sure words of God. They set up their own minds as being the final authority and correct every bible version out there. Mr. White often corrects his own NASB and thinks it too has errors. They don’t believe any translation can be the inspired words of God, and since the “originals” no longer exist, they have no inspired Bible and resent the fact that many of us believe we do. They want to be the Final Authority and have you come to them to find out what God really said. It*



*is a big ego trip, easy to get into and very hard to get out of. I feel sorry for all the Christians who have been robbed of the true Holy Bible by unbelieving modern scholars.”*

White now moves to attack the reading **“Lord God”** in 1 Peter 3:15 in the AV1611. He believes that the verse should read *“Christ as Lord”* as in the NRSV that Whites quotes for this verse (why is unclear), NASV, NIV, which reading almost matches *“the Lord Christ”* JB, DR, JR and *“the Christ as Lord”* NWT. He seeks to justify this belief by means of reference to *“sharing the deity of Christ with one of Jehovah’s Witnesses”* using 1 Peter 3:15 and Isaiah 8:12-13, which has the expression **“the Lord of hosts”** in the AV1611 but also the NRSV, NASV. (The NIV has *“the Lord Almighty.”*)

White states that, *“A comparison of the Greek translation of this passage in the Septuagint version shows that when Peter uses this passage in his epistle, he replaces the Greek, which reads, “Lord of hosts” with “Christ as Lord.” Just as the prophet Isaiah spoke of sanctifying (regarding holy) the Lord of hosts, so Peter speaks of sanctifying Christ as Lord, plainly identifying Christ as the LORD, Yahweh...A person carrying the NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, or any number of other modern translations can show this passage to one of Jehovah’s Witnesses. A person carrying the KJV or NKJV, however, cannot. Why? Because the Greek text utilized by the KJV and NKJV does not have “Christ” here at 1 Peter 3:15. Instead, following the majority of Greek texts, but ignoring the united testimony of the most ancient texts and translations, the Textus Receptus has “Lord God” as its reading, completely obscuring this wonderful testimony to the deity of Christ...those who would invest the TR with infallibility force us to abandon this passage as evidence of the deity of our Lord.”*

As usual, as will be shown, it is James White who is guilty of *“obscuring...the deity of Christ.”* And who is investing *“the TR with infallibility”*? White’s book is aimed at refuting so-called *“King James Onlyism.”* Yet the reader is now effectively confronted with *‘TR Onlyism.’* White is clearly being ‘inconsistent’ yet again. Note also White’s use of the term *“utilized”* again. See Dr Ruckman’s comment above. *“Scholarship Only advocates BELIEVE nothing: they “utilize” translations.”*

Note also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments above with respect to White’s use of the erroneous term *“Yahweh”* and Dr Ruckman’s refutation<sup>137</sup> of a pre-Christian Septuagint that White implies actually existed – also in his chapter endnote no. 30<sup>3</sup> p 221.

Of the ancient texts and translations, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, possibly following Jerome’s Vulgate<sup>142</sup> on this occasion, has *“the Lord Christ”* in 1 Peter 3:15. However, the bibles of Tyn-dale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all match the AV1611 reading with **“the Lord God.”** These three versions also use the term **“sanctify”** in agreement with the AV1611, Wycliffe having the synonym *“hallow.”*

‘Our critic’ also attacked<sup>8</sup> p 309-310 1 Peter 3:15, for the same reasons as James White.

*“Our critic [maintains] that “1 Peter 3:15 is another example of the KJV missing the deity of Christ. This verse is based on Isaiah 8:13 and is typical of many instances in the NT where what is spoken of God in the OT is ascribed to Christ in the NT - writers are thereby affirming his deity. The KJV using an inferior text misses this clear affirmation that Christ is God”...*

*“The relevant portion of 1 Peter 3:15 in the AV1611 reads **“But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts:”***

*“The relevant portion of Isaiah 8:13 in the AV1611 reads **“Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself;”***

*“The corresponding readings in the NIV are “But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord.” 1 Peter 3:15 and “The Lord Almighty is the one you are to regard as holy,” Isaiah 8:13. In his reference to Isaiah 8:13, our critic by-passed the attacks by the NIV on Christ’s deity in the very next chapter, verse 6<sup>8 p 31</sup> [the NIV, NKJV, NASV, NRSV all omit the capitalised definite article “The” with respect to “The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.” Although Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> does not retain the definite articles, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bibshops’<sup>138</sup> bibles do retain them, although without capitalisation].*

*“Agreeing with the NIV in 1 Peter 3:15 are the DR, RV, JB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A, W [Nestle, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup>].*

*“The association between 1 Peter 3:15 and Isaiah 8:13 is much clearer in the AV1611 than in the NIV because the AV1611 uses the word “sanctify” in each verse.*

*“In fact, the NIV [along with the RSV, NASV, NRSV] has subtly erased ALL DIRECT REFERENCE TO DEITY in the verse. Thanks to the modern editors - see above - it has omitted the word “God”. Moreover, the term “Christ AS Lord” NIV, is NOT identical to “Jesus IS THE Lord” 1 Corinthians 12:3\*. The RV, NIV, JB, NWT all omit “the” [Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all retain “the” in 1 Corinthians 12:3].”*

\*Note correction from “Christ” (as in Philippians 2:11) to “Jesus.” Apologies for any confusion.

*“The term “Christ AS Lord” appears nowhere in the Bible for this simple reason. Christ IS the Lord. He should not be only likened to the Lord by the word “as” which in the NIV construction appears as a relative pronoun denoting comparison of high quality, which is not necessarily identical quality.*

*“Elsewhere in his letter Peter uses the word “as” in this proverbial sense:*

*““as of a lamb” 1:19, “the lamb of God” John 1:29 but not a literal lamb.*

*““as grass” 1:24, obviously not literal grass.*

*““As newborn babes” 2:2, spiritual babes but not literal babies.*

*““as lively stones” 2:5, not literal stones.*

*““as sheep” 2:25, not literal sheep.*

*““as a roaring lion” 5:8, not a literal lion.*

*“The same sense is found in 2 Samuel 19:27 and Galatians 4:14.*

*“The NIV uses “like” instead of “as” in all of these verses except in 1:19, where no pronoun is used and in Galatians 4:14 where “as if” is used. No doubt it uses “as” in 1 Peter 3:15 because “like” would not fit easily into the wording of the sentence but “as” here retains the same sense.”*

Note in sum that support for the reading “Christ as Lord” that White favours comes from essentially corrupt sources and the reading does not confer Deity on the Lord Jesus Christ, whereas support for the AV1611 reading “the Lord God” comes from the faithful translations that brought in the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation. The modern reading hasn’t helped bring in any kind of Reformation or revival.

Moreover, even the word “sanctify” on its own does not necessarily confirm Deity. The word can apply to ordinary humans or even objects.

***“Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy: for I am the LORD your God”*** Leviticus 20:7.

***“And Joshua said unto the people, Sanctify yourselves: for to morrow the LORD will do wonders among you”*** Joshua 3:5.

***“I am come to sacrifice unto the LORD: sanctify yourselves, and come with me to the sacrifice. And he sanctified Jesse and his sons, and called them to the sacrifice”*** 1 Samuel 16:5b.

***“And David answered the priest, and said unto him, Of a truth women have been kept from us about these three days, since I came out, and the vessels of the young men are holy, and the bread is in a manner common, yea, though it were sanctified this day in the vessel”*** 1 Samuel 21:5.

Nevertheless, 1 Peter 3:15, when read in context with 1 Peter 3:16 *does* confirm the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

***“Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evildoers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ”*** 1 Peter 3:16.

***“Good conversation”*** or conduct is sanctified conduct that begins in the heart, Luke 8:15 that has been sanctified or set apart for the Lord Jesus Christ, ***“the Lord God”*** of 1 Peter 3:15.

Therefore, to paraphrase White, ‘A person carrying the NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, or any number of other modern translations canNOT show this passage to one of Jehovah’s Witnesses. A person carrying the KJV...CAN [especially if the person believes it as well]. Why? Because the Greek text utilized by the NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, or any number of other modern translations does not have ***“THE Lord God”*** here in 1 Peter 3:15.’

Charles Salliby<sup>61</sup> p 15-16 observes, rightly, with respect to 1 Peter 3:15 that *“Since it is Christ Who dwells in our hearts by faith according to Eph. 3:17, one could easily assume that Christ is the One being referred to here in 1 Pet. 3:15. As we can see, even the scholars who rewrote it thought so. However, while you can point to Christ’s deity in the stronger expression “Lord God” of the KJV, the NIV [and RSV, NASV, NRSV etc.] prevents this with its less convincing “Christ as Lord.”*”

Note further that White gives no assurance that his supposed method of *“sharing the deity of Christ with one of Jehovah’s Witnesses”* actually works.

By contrast, Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7</sup> Part 3 has these comments on a method of leading a Jehovah’s Witness to the Lord Jesus Christ, which is effective, her emphases. See the outline at the start of this chapter.

James White then claims that *“the deity of the Lord Jesus is more plainly revealed in modern translations than in the KJV [in] Jude 4...”*

He cites the NASV, which reads *“our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ”* versus the AV1611 ***“the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”***

White continues, his emphases.

*“The TR adds one word here, “God,” which results in the disruption of the flow and the introduction of a second person into the text, “the Lord God,” who is then differentiated from the Lord Jesus Christ. Most would feel that “Lord God” would be referring to the Father.*

*“However, the modern texts contain a very clear testimony to the deity of Christ, for the term that is translated “Master” by the NASB is also translated “Sovereign” by the NIV in the same passage. It is a very strong term in the Greek language [that]...is also used of God as Master. Note Acts 4:24 (NIV): “When they heard this, they raised their voices together in prayer to God. “Sovereign Lord,” they said, “you made the heaven and the earth and the sea, and everything in them.””*

*“Jude tells us that there is only one “Sovereign Lord,” and that is Jesus Christ. I have often pointed this passage out to Jehovah’s Witnesses and asked, “Now, can you say with Jude that you have **only one** Sovereign Lord? Or do you have **two**, Jehovah, and Jesus Christ?” The point is rarely missed. But the KJV’s rendering obscures this by following inferior manuscripts, resulting in a reading that allows one to distinguish between the “Lord God” and the Lord Jesus Christ.”*

White fails to explain how the second occurrence of the word **“God”** causes any disruption in Jude 4 and he doesn’t state what *“the flow”* is, although in a note<sup>3 p 221</sup> on this passage, he inconsistently criticises Dr Mrs Riplinger for a lack of explanation because she *“lists [Jude 4] as denying the deity of Christ, though no explanation is given as to how this comes from the text itself.”* Dr Riplinger’s analysis that includes Jude 4 will be considered below.

White’s criticism of the TR – and the AV1611 – is invalid because the Lord Jesus Christ said so.

**“That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. *He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him*”** John 5:23.

Dishonouring ***“the only Lord God”*** e.g. by outright denial, is the same as dishonouring ***“our Lord Jesus Christ”*** by denial, because each is God, although different Persons of the Godhead. White would have understood this equivalence in Jude 4, if he knew the scriptures and if he didn’t despise the term ***“Godhead.”*** See remarks on Colossians 2:9 above and Will Kinney’s comments below on White’s opinion of Jude 4.

White’s question to the Jehovah’s Witnesses may have repeatedly elicited the answer that he sought but a Jehovah’s Witness could declare that he has *“only one Sovereign Lord”* i.e. Jehovah but also a *“Lord”* i.e. Jesus Christ, exercising delegated sovereignty from Jehovah. The scripture has the illustration, insofar as the Jews declared that they had ***“no king but Caesar”*** John 19:15, although at the time they did have a king, Herod, Mark 6: 14, who was the local sovereign on behalf of Caesar. So White’s notion that the modern versions are superior to the AV1611 in Jude 4 with respect to refutation of Watchtower teaching is false.

White has a further note to the effect that *“The term “God” is not found in the papyrus manuscripts P 72, 78, Sinaiticus (8) Alexandrinus (A) Vaticanus (B), numerous other texts and translations as well.”*

Note that like James White, who accuses the King James translators of using *“inferior manuscripts”* for Jude 4, ‘our critic’ above accuses the King James translators of using an *“inferior text”* with respect to 1 Peter 3:15. See **Chapter 3** for an evaluation of the sources that White considers to be ‘superior’ to those underlying the AV1611 Text and Chapter 9 of this author’s earlier work<sup>8</sup>.

**Table A1, Appendix**, shows that the NIV, JB, DR, JR and NWT all omit ***“God”*** from the phrase in question in Jude 4 and that the NIV, NASV readings closely match those of the JB, NWT, indicating that the modern versions are in good agreement with Rome and

Watchtower *against* the AV1611. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> also omit **“God”** from Jude 4, thus influencing Nestle and Westcott and Hort’s RV. See again remarks under *Modern ‘Scholarly’ Bitterness – and Untrustworthiness* for an overview of these ungodly earlier Greek text editors.

By contrast, although Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, probably influenced by Jerome’s Vulgate<sup>142</sup>, omits **“God”** from Jude 4, the bibles of Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> that brought in the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation all agree with the AV1611 in retaining **“God”** in the phrase **“the only Lord God.”**

Moreover, if *“the modern texts contain a very clear testimony to the deity of Christ”* in Jude 4, why does White have to resort to *two* modern versions for the same verse and *“the Greek language”*? The citing of *three* multiple authorities for this purpose suggests a testimony that is anything but *“clear.”*

Concerning White’s cross reference to Acts 4:24, the AV1611 has the unequivocal statement **“Lord, thou art God”** in this verse and the pattern of witnesses for and against this reading is similar to that for Jude 4, except that the modern Greek editors aren’t as unified as they are with respect to deleting **“God”** from Jude 4. Griesbach and Wordsworth appear to retain **“God”** in Acts 4:24 while Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles omit **“God”** from Acts 4:24 and Alford regards the word as doubtful. In turn, however, these four editors influence Nestle and Westcott and Hort’s RV so that **“God”** is also omitted from Acts 4:24 in those sources.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, again probably influenced by Jerome’s Vulgate<sup>142</sup>, omits **“God”** from the above phrase in Acts 4:24 but the bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all retain **“God”** here, in agreement with the AV1611.

The DR, JR, NIV, NASV, JB, NWT all agree in omitting **“God”** from the phrase **“Lord, thou art God”** in Acts 4:24 and the NWT reads **“Sovereign Lord”** identically with the NIV, revealing once again the consistency of the modern versions in matching Rome and Watchtower *against* the AV1611.

This pattern is repeated so often in the verses that White quotes in favour of the modern versions that they cannot be regarded as true bibles any more than the corruptions stemming from those two decidedly Satanic offspring.

**“Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them”** Matthew 7:20

Returning to Jude 4, White omits to give the reference to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work<sup>14 p 305</sup>, which is possibly an oversight on his part or a deliberate omission to minimise the risk of his readers discovering that he is lying again. However, his criticism is unjustified.

Dr Mrs Riplinger gives a clear demonstration of the denial of the Lord’s Deity by the modern versions in this verse, by way of illustration, because she lists it as one several verses where titles of Deity that refer to the Lord Jesus Christ are omitted by the modern versions. The verses that she lists in addition to Jude 4 are as follows.

Acts 2:30 reads **“he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne”** i.e. David’s throne but this throne is also **“the throne of thy glory”** Jeremiah 14:21, i.e. God’s glory, so the Lord Jesus Christ is God, because He occupies God’s throne on earth, Matthew 25:31<sup>88 p 107</sup>. However, the NIV, NASV alter **“Christ”** to **“one of his descendants”** and lose all reference to the Lord’s Deity.

Romans 5:9 reads “***Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him***” which is a reference to “*the redeemed of the Lord*” Psalm 107:2, Ephesians 1:7, or “*the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood*” Acts 20:28, such that Romans 5:9 must refer to God in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. However, the NIV, NASV break the reference to the Lord’s Deity with the reading “*saved from the wrath of God through Him*” implying two separate persons.

Romans 14:10b, 12 read “***we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ...So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God***” i.e. the Lord Jesus Christ is God Who exercises judgement and to Whom accounts are given but the NIV, NASV alter “*Christ*” to “*God*” in Romans 14:10 and obscure the Lord’s Deity.

1 Corinthians 10:9 reads “***Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents***” i.e. when “*the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people*” Numbers 21:6, it was Lord Jesus Christ Who inflicted this punishment upon the children of Israel but the NIV, NASV alter “*Christ*” to “*Lord*” in 1 Corinthians 10:9, obscuring the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

1 John 3:16a reads “***Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us***” i.e. the Lord Jesus Christ, Who laid down His life for us, is God but the NIV, NASV omit “*God*” from 1 John 3:16.

Revelation 1:11 reads “***I am the Alpha and Omega***” but the NIV, NASV omit this statement. Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that, “*As the chapter [Revelation 1] is written in the KJV, it is the best defence of the deity of Christ that can be shown to a Jehovah’s Witness. They believe that the Alpha and Omega is God, but their version agrees with the new versions which obscure the deity of Christ.*”

See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s outline at the start of this chapter for leading a Jehovah’s Witness to the Lord Jesus Christ.

In Jude 4, White forgets that the expression “***the only Lord God, and Lord Jesus Christ***” could apply simultaneously to the Lord Jesus Christ as God and the First and Second Persons of the Godhead. See comments above. Either way (or both), Jude 4 testifies unequivocally to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ because the Christian only has “***One Lord***” Ephesians 4:5.

Will Kinney<sup>158</sup> has these comments on White’s criticisms of the Holy Bible in Jude 4.

*“The Book of Jude - James White’s “inferior” texts*

*“In his book, The King James Only Controversy, James White makes a lot of outrageous statements in an attempt to destroy the Christian’s faith in the King James Bible.*

*“In one section of his book he discusses the reading of the KJB in Jude verse four. On page 206 of his book Mr. White brings up his experience in speaking to Jehovah witnesses and he says: “I have often pointed this passage out to Jehovah’s Witnesses and asked, “Now, can you say with Jude that you have only one Sovereign Lord? Or do you have two, Jehovah, and Jesus Christ?” The point is rarely missed. But the KJV’s rendering obscures this by following INFERIOR (caps are mine) manuscripts, resulting in a reading that allows one to distinguish between the “Lord God” and the Lord Jesus Christ.”*

*“It should first be pointed out that many Christians see a reference to two persons of the Godhead in this verse, both God the Father and God the Son.*

*“Matthew Henry comments: “Those who turn the grace of God into lasciviousness do in effect deny the Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ; that is, they deny both natural and revealed religion. They strike at the foundation of natural religion, for they deny the only Lord God; and they overturn all the frame of revealed religion, for they deny the Lord Jesus Christ.”*

*“Likewise John Gill remarks: “And denying the only Lord God; God the Father, who is the only sovereign Lord, both in providence and grace; and the only God, not to the exclusion of the Son and Spirit, but in opposition to nominal and fictitious deities, or Heathen gods; And our Lord Jesus Christ; as his deity, or sonship, or humanity, or that he was the Messiah, or the alone Saviour, or his sacrifice, satisfaction, and righteousness;”*

*“Secondly, if we adopt the view that this verse speaks of only the second Person of the Godhead, the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, the King James reading is more accurate than the NASB and NIV. Mr. White misses on both of his objections to the KJB reading. The King James Bible is both theologically correct and based on superior manuscripts as we shall see...*

*“If this verse is referring to Jesus Christ as THE only Lord God and OUR Lord Jesus Christ, the KJB is correct. Jesus Christ is THE only Lord God and creator of all people and things, but He is OUR Lord only of His redeemed.*

*“Notice the distinctions brought out in Jude 9, 14, 17, 21 and 25. In verse 9 Michael the archangel says to Satan “the Lord rebuke thee”; in 14 it is “the Lord” who comes to execute judgment upon the ungodly; in 17 he speaks to other Christians ‘of the apostles of “our” Lord Jesus Christ’; in 21 we are looking for the mercy of “our” Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life; and in 25 he closes in a benediction to the only wise God “our” Saviour.*

*“In Jude 4 the NASB reads: “deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ.” The NIV has: “deny Jesus Christ our only Sovereign and Lord”, while the J. W. bible reads: “our only Owner and Lord, Jesus Christ.” The Jehovah Witness version reads basically like the NASB and the JWs still don’t believe Jesus Christ is God. In fact, with neither the NIV nor the NASB can you prove that Jesus Christ is God using Jude verse four. Mr. White’s objection to the KJB is pointless.*

*“A Jehovah Witness can easily reply that Jesus is sovereign only in so far as JEHOVAH gave him that designated authority, but Jesus is still less and inferior to Jehovah.*

*“As a side note, I personally am convinced that the Lord Jesus Christ is JEHOVAH God, but if you are using the NKJV, NIV or NASB you might well ask “Who is JEHOVAH? I don’t see that word in my bible.” The name JEHOVAH has been removed from the NKJV, NIV and NASB.*

*“The main point I want to look at is the statement by Mr. White that the KJB follows INFERIOR manuscripts. The omission of the word “GOD” in the NASB, NIV is based on a handful of Greek manuscripts that Mr. White seems to imply are then SUPERIOR to the “inferior” majority of all remaining Greek copies we have today which are the basis of the KJB. According to Mr. White these “superior” manuscripts are Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, A, C and P72.*

*“Let’s examine more closely what these “superior” manuscripts actually say. We will soon learn that they are in constant disagreement not only with the majority of Greek texts but with each other as well.*

“1. “Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them THAT ARE SANCTIFIED by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called”

““Them that are sanctified” is the reading of the Majority or 90% plus of all remaining Greek manuscripts we have today, plus several uncial or capital letter manuscripts. However the NASB, NIV read BELOVED or LOVED instead of sanctified. This reading comes from Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, C and P72.

“In verse three the NKJV departs from the Greek text of the KJB and follows the Westcott-Hort text of the NASB, NIV. The NKJV does not follow the same Greek text of the KJB in at least 40 places I have personally found so far, and I am not yet done with that study.

““Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of THE common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

“The reading of the TR of the KJB and the Majority is THE (tes) common salvation. The TR is the Textus Receptus, or the traditional Received Text that underlies the King James Bible. This is in contrast to the modern Critical Text that differs from the TR by changing or omitting some 5,000 words from the New Testament. I like to refer to it as the Textus Corruptus.

“However Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, A and P72 say OUR (hemoon) common salvation and this is the reading of the NKJV and NASB. The NIV paraphrases even this as “the salvation we share” introducing a verb where none is found in any Greek text. It should also be noted that Sinaiticus adds additional words to this text which are not found in the others. Sinaiticus says: “our salvation AND LIFE”, but no version has adopted this additional reading - yet.

“Verse 4 is where we get into the interesting and totally hypocritical comments made by James White in his book *The King James Only Controversy*.

“The reading of the Textus Receptus, the Majority, K, L, P and others is as it stands in the KJB. “...ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord GOD, and our Lord Jesus Christ.” In the NASB and NIV the word GOD is missing because the word God or Theos is not found in Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, A, C and P72.

“In the very next verse these same 5 “superior” manuscripts all go each one their separate ways and they continue to do so in the remainder of this small book of Jude which contains only 25 verses...

“Continuing in Jude verse 5, we see that Sinaiticus reads “You knew ALL THINGS (panta), instead of THIS (touto), and it omits the word ONCE (hapax), while P72, A and C omit the word YOU (humas), though it is in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

“Sinaiticus omits the definite article THE in “the Lord”, but it is in C, while A and Vaticanus read JESUS...and P72 reads GOD CHRIST instead of THE LORD! These are the “superior” manuscripts Mr. White refers to when he calls the KJB texts inferior! None of them agree with each other in very substantial ways, and all this occurs right after the verse Mr. White criticizes in the KJB.

“And still the NASB and NIV do not agree with each other. The NASB says: “though you know ALL THINGS once for all, that the Lord...” while the NIV has: “though you already



know ALL THIS” - the NIV makes up its own text here as none of the 5 “superior” nor any of the majority texts read this way...

“In Jude 12 we read of these wicked men “feeding THEMSELVES (heautous) without fear”, and so read Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, but C reads “feeding YOU”, while P72 says “feeding THEM.”

“Also to be noted is that the Majority, TR, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus read “in your FEASTS OF CHARITY,” but A and C read: “in your DECEPTIONS” ...

“In 14 we read of a future prophecy. “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord COMETH with ten thousand of his saints.”

““The Lord COMETH” is the translation of the KJB, the NKJV, Tyndale, Geneva, even the NIV and the NRSV, but the NASB says “the Lord CAME with many thousands of his holy ones” - like it already happened - Duh, I don’t recall that happening yet, do you?.

““Ten thousand of his saints” is the reading of the Majority, B, A and C, but again we see the so called superior manuscripts contradict each other. Sinaiticus and P72 omit HIS (autou) and read ANGELS (aggeloon) instead of SAINTS or holy ones (hagioon).

“V. 15 “To execute judgment upon all, and to convince ALL THAT ARE UNGODLY AMONG THEM of all THEIR UNGODLY DEEDS...” This is the reading of the Majority and the TR of the KJB.

““All the ungodly” is the reading of the Majority, Vaticanus, A and C. It is also the reading found in the NKJV, NASB, NIV...but Sinaiticus and P72 again split off and read EVERY SOUL (pasan psuke) instead of “all the ungodly” (pantas tous asebeis). What is of great interest here is that the modern Nestle-Aland Greek texts keep changing every few years. The Nestle-Aland text USED TO READ “all the ungodly”, but NOW they have once again changed their actual Greek text to read “to convict EVERY SOUL”, so even their latest modern versions do not agree with their own latest Nestle-Aland, UBS Critical text.

“The words AMONG THEM are also omitted by the 5 “superior” texts, but found in the Majority. In this same verse the phrase “of all their ungodly deeds” (peri pantoon toon ergoon asebeias autoon) reads the same in the Majority and C, but Vaticanus omits THEIR, while Sinaiticus and C add WORDS (logoon) and Sinaiticus omits “ungodly deeds” altogether. Thus we see that Mr. White’s oldest and best manuscripts are in total disarray and disagreement among themselves - and this not once but hundreds of times throughout the entire New Testament.

“In verse 16 we read: “These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and THEIR MOUTH SPEAKETH GREAT SWELLING WORDS, HAVING MEN’S PERSONS IN ADMIRATION because of advantage.”

“In this verse P72 omits the whole phrase “walking after their own lusts”, but it is found in the others. “Their mouth speaketh great swelling words” is the reading of the KJB, the ASV and the Revised Version word for word.

“The NASB says: “they speak arrogantly” omitting the literal “their mouth” and changing the meaning of the phrase. There is a difference between speaking great swelling words and speaking arrogantly. The NIV says: “they boast about themselves” again omitting “their mouth”, changing “speak” to “boast” and adding “about themselves”, which is not in any text at all.

*“In verse 20, “building up yourselves on your most holy faith”, P72 has a different word order, spells 5 words differently than any other text and omits YOUR faith, while manuscript C changes YOUR faith to OUR faith.*

*“In 21 we read: “Keep YOURSELVES in the love of God” and this is the reading of the Majority, Sinaiticus and A, but Vaticanus and C read LET US KEEP. But both the NASB and NIV rejected the reading of their favorite Vaticanus here and read as does the KJB.*

*“In verse 22 we read: “And of some HAVE COMPASSION, MAKING A DIFFERENCE.” The verb “have compassion” is eleete in the Majority and TR, but Sin/Vat have a different form in eleate; both A and C say REBUKE instead of have compassion and P72 entirely omits the verb...*

*“23. “And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.” This is the reading of the Majority and the TR of the KJB. However the NASB and NIV add “AND ON SOME HAVE MERCY” to this verse. This reading comes from Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and A. However, A and Vaticanus omit “on some”, though it is in Sinaiticus and C reads as does the KJB and does not include these extra words. Are you beginning to get the picture of how mixed up and confused these “superior” texts are that Mr. White recommends?*

*“24. “Now unto him that is able to keep YOU from falling...” YOU is found in all the texts except A which reads US instead of YOU and P72 omits the word altogether.*

*“25. “To the only WISE God our Saviour be glory AND majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.” Again this is the reading of the Majority and the TR, but the “superior” texts of Mr. White have added a lot of different words to this verse.*

*“The NASB and NIV omit WISE from “only wise God” - (P72, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus omit “wise”) - and omit the word AND, though it is found in P72 which predates Sinaiticus and Vaticanus by about 100 years. The NASB [and] NIV say: “to the only God our Savior be glory, majesty, power and authority, THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD, BEFORE ALL AGES, now and forevermore. Amen.”*

*“All of these eight added words in the NIV represent 10 extra words in the Greek which come from the usual suspects -Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, A and C. However Sinaiticus omits the word pantas (ALL) while included in B and A, but what is quite interesting here is that P72, which is 100 years older than Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, does not contain these added eight words but reads like the King James Bible, though it does omit the word “wise”.*

*“The oldest manuscript we have reads as does the KJB in this particular verse (except for “wise”), yet Mr. White and other scholars like him choose to use readings found in their favorite two which are constantly differing from each other. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are not the oldest and they certainly are not the best.*

*“James White’s criticism of the KJB reading in Jude 4 is seen to be without basis. His assertion that the KJB is based on “inferior” texts and that the others are “superior” has been shown to be completely false.*

*“If Mr. White’s “superior” manuscripts are the best we have, then we are in BIG trouble and God has failed to preserve His words. We are left with the vain hope that somehow our great present day scholars, like Mr. White, might get lucky and rescue God’s words from the dumpster of history.*

*“Either God has been faithful to preserve His pure, perfect and inspired words in the King James Bible or they are lost forever. If God cannot preserve His words as He promised, then maybe He will also fail in preserving our souls. How can a Christian trust Him for the one and yet deny the other?”*

Kinney’s findings in Jude for Vaticanus and Sinaiticus match those of Burgon with respect to the Gospels. See *The Revision Conspiracy* for Burgon’s analyses of Luke 11:2, 4 and Mark 2:1-12. In sum, as Will Kinney remarked, White’s objections to the AV1611 reading *“the only Lord God”* in Jude 4 are *“pointless.”*

White now focuses on 1 Timothy 3:16 and tries to defend the modern alterations to the AV1611 reading *“God was manifest in the flesh.”* This verse has been addressed in **Chapter 4 – “Putting It Together”** and therefore White’s next point of attack, Mark 1:1, will be now considered. However, note remarks earlier on this verse in **Chapter 4** and **Chapter 5 – “The King James Only Camp.”**

White’s objection to the Holy Bible in Mark 1:1 concerns the phrase *“the Son of God”* with respect to the absence of any marginal reading *“Some manuscripts do not have ‘the Son of God’”* that is found as a footnote in modern versions such as the NIV, NASV. He insists, his emphasis that, *“Modern translations of the Bible...include textual footnotes to indicate to the reader where the Greek or Hebrew manuscripts contain variants. KJV Only advocates, generally, dislike such footnotes, feeling that they “confuse” the reader, and that they are, in fact, faith-destroying...many defenders of the AV seem to be unaware of the fact, noted previously [see Chapter 4 – “Putting It Together” and the comments of Dr Holland, David Cloud and Dr Moorman], that the King James Version contained 8,422 such marginal readings and notes when it was first published...Most of these notes gave alternative readings, but some indicated the fact that the KJV translators recognized the existence of textual variations in the Greek and Hebrew texts. One example should suffice to demonstrate that the dislike of textual notes on the part of AV Only advocates is more than slightly inconsistent. Note the KJV’s own marginal reference at Luke 10:22: “many ancient copies add these words, ‘And turning to his disciples, he said.’” If the KJV is not “attacking God’s Word” with such marginal notes, why is the NASB or NIV?*

*“With reference to Mark 1:1, the fact is that modern versions such as the NASB, RSV, NIV, and NRSV all have “the Son of God” in the main text. Each appends a textual note indicating the fact that some ancient manuscripts do not contain the phrase. Since this is the case...one cannot seriously suggest (though many do) that there is some sort of effort on the part of modern translations to deny that Jesus is the Son of God! As we have seen over and over and over again, the truth that is here proclaimed, that Jesus is the Son of God, is repeated over and over again in the modern translations...therefore, if translators were trying to “hide” this truth, they have done a very, very bad job of it in the new translations!”*

It is actually White who has *“done a very, very bad job”* of covering up for modern Satanic counterfeits like the NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV.

White’s attempt by means of Luke 10:22 to accuse bible believers of being *“more than slightly inconsistent”* with respect to marginal notes is itself another example of White’s ‘inconsistency.’

The phrase *“And turning to his disciples, he said”* is found in Stephanus’s Receptus but it is absent from the later edition of Eleziever<sup>62</sup>. (Griesbach and Tregelles also omit the phrase and Alford regards it as doubtful.) However, it is found in what this site<sup>159</sup> calls *The Byzantine Majority*, i.e. the majority of Greek manuscripts collated so far – see re-

marks on von Soden's collation in *Chapter 3* – which probably indicates why Stephanus included it.

Nevertheless, the phrase is not found in Luke 10:22 in any of the faithful precursors to the AV1611, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup>. Nor is it found in Scrivener's 1894 Greek New Testament, which is a back translation of the AV1611 New Testament, which mainly follows Beza's 4<sup>th</sup> Edition of 1588-9<sup>65 p 220</sup>. Scrivener's back translation is therefore primarily, although not exclusively<sup>39 p 947ff</sup>, Beza's Greek Text.

However, the King James translators did consult Stephanus's Receptus<sup>8 p 26</sup> and used it, even if in only minor respects, 59 times against their main source for the Receptus, that of Beza.

The King's men therefore rightly noted in the margin of Luke 10 the redundant phrase – see verse 23 that White omits to mention – which nevertheless survived in enough manuscripts for it to be retained by one of their principal guides for the Greek New Testament. The marginal note for Luke 10:22 is therefore included simply for information, reflecting the genuine scholarly objectivity of the King James translators, who also rightly concluded that the phrase did not belong in the verse, as a reading of the context of Luke 10:22-23 will confirm.

White's "*example*" intended to 'prove' that bible believers are 'inconsistent' is therefore misleading, because the modern footnote for Mark 1:1 is entirely spurious.

White ridicules bible believers' distrust of footnotes – see his remarks above – but he is then forced to admit, in an obscure endnote<sup>3 p 221</sup> to this chapter that "*We must agree that the NASB's "Many mss." is in error\*. Actually very few manuscripts do not contain the phrase.*" White's note reveals that he is himself "*in error*" in the text of his book because "*very few*" is not the same as "*some*."

\*The note is no longer found in the latest, online version of the NASV, which immediately deprives White of *any* basis for attacking the AV1611 in Mark 1:1.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 74</sup> confirms that only the original of Ⲁ, Aleph and Θ, Theta, omit "*the Son of God*" from Mark 1:1 amongst the uncial manuscripts and only "*a few or none*" of the cursives omit the phrase, not "*some*," which term has a different designation in Dr Moorman's work.

So both White and the modern versions have misled the reader at this point, showing that bible believers have reason to regard the textual notes in the modern versions as suspect, for example, those in the NIV<sup>8 p 66, 74</sup> that describe the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus as "*the most reliable early manuscripts*" with respect to Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11.

Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 132, 135</sup> has incisive comment on Mark 1:1 with respect to the spurious nature of the modern footnote, his emphases. See his remarks earlier on Mark 1:1, 2 in *Chapter 7*.

*"From the first verse of S. Mark's Gospel, we are informed that 'Some ancient authorities omit 'the Son of God.'* Why are we **not** informed that every known uncial copy **except one of bad character** [i.e. Ⲁ, Sinaiticus. Θ, Theta was not discovered at the time of Burgon's writing], - every cursive **but two**, - **every Version**, - and the following Fathers, all **contain** the precious clause: viz. Irenaeus, - Porphory, - Severianus of Gabala, - Cyril Alex., - Victor Ant., - and others, - besides Ambrose and Augustine among the Latins:- while the supposed adverse testimony of Serapion and Titus, Basil and Victorinus, Cyril of Jer. And Epiphanius, proves to be all a mistake? To speak plainly, since the clause is above suspicion, **Why are we not rather told so?**

*“Why then, (it will of course be asked) is the margin...of S. Mark i. 1...encumbered after this discreditable fashion? It is (we answer) only because **the Text of Drs Westcott and Hort is thus depraved...**”*

As is the book of James White.

White’s duplicity with respect to the footnote of Mark 1:1 in the modern versions and that of Luke 10:22 leads inevitably to the conclusion that, to paraphrase White again – see remarks above on 1 Peter 3:15 – ‘one CAN seriously suggest (many rightly do) that there is some sort of effort on the part of modern translations to deny that Jesus is the Son of God!’

White’s insistence that *“the truth that is here proclaimed, that Jesus is the Son of God”* is found repeatedly in the modern versions is reminiscent of the remarks<sup>8 p 325</sup> of ‘our critic’ that *“the truth that Christ is God manifest in the flesh...is taught repeatedly in the N.T. especially in Johannine and Pauline theology.”* Like ‘our critic,’ White has failed to substantiate his claim with any references cited at this point, although genuine researchers like Dr Mrs Riplinger have furnished many examples that refute White’s claim. See remarks above with respect to Jude 4 and the 135 verses that she lists<sup>7 Part 7</sup> as *“Names and titles of Jesus omitted in the NIV”* or downgraded.

Chick Salliby<sup>61 p 66</sup> originally compiled this list. Note his remarks in **Chapter 3** and his conclusion.

*“All of the above should cause one to question why, in view of this overrun of nonessential unauthorized titles, were so many authorized titles of Jesus removed from the NIV, where it was necessary for the reader to have them. God knew where He wanted the name of Jesus in the Bible, as He did every other word, jot, or title. Therefore, whether His choices agree with our current ideas or not, or can be defended on grounds for which we find any sufficient reasoning at all, it is the duty of all translators of GOD’S WORD to provide for the reader GOD’S WORD. Or else they should entitle their book by some other name.”*

As for White’s attempt to justify the modern version attacks on the Lord Jesus Christ by means of irony as *“a very, very bad job,”* over 30 verses have been addressed so far in this chapter where, by inspection, the modern versions *have* attempted to delete or downgrade references to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Second Person of the Godhead – in addition to the 6 verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists in association with Jude 4 and which have been discussed above.

White forgets that the modern translators are like the Gibeonites of old. ***“They did work wily, and went and made as if they had been ambassadors”*** Joshua 9:4, or true witnesses.

Whereas, like the priests, scribes and Jewish elders of Jesus’s time, they ***“consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill him”*** Matthew 26:4.

White’s<sup>3 p 210-211, 262-3</sup> next attack is on the reading ***“Son of God”*** in John 9:35, replaced by *“Son of Man”* in the NIV, NASV and in the JB, NWT. See **Appendix, Table A1**. He insists that, *“There is a very strong case to be made for the modern reading, “Son of Man.” This passage is normally cited, however, as evidence of some bias against the deity of Christ by KJV Only advocates. But we must ask, “Is the phrase ‘Son of Man’ any less a title of deity than ‘Son of God’?...Note just a few passages from Matthew’s gospel:”*

White then quotes Matthew 9:6, 12:8, with respect to *“the Son of Man”* forgiving sins and being *“Lord of the Sabbath”* as examples of the term *“Son of Man”* indicating the

Lord's Deity. White then quotes John 13:31 from the NASV with respect to "*the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him.*"

White continues, his emphases.

*"When the Lord himself uses terms such as "glorified" with reference to the Son of Man, obviously there is no idea that the Son of Man is a lesser title in His mind than "Son of God." Therefore, the use of "Son of Man" at John 9:35 cannot logically be taken as in any way diminishing a translation's testimony to the exalted character of the Lord Jesus Christ. This **should** be plain to even the most die-hard defenders of the KJV, especially when they are quick to point to another passage, John 3:13, which also uses the phrase "Son of Man," even in their AV, and yet here they have no problem seeing Christ's deity in the title! Inconsistency, we repeat, is not glorifying to God."*

The 'inconsistency' is White's, with respect his attempt to justify the modern reading in John 9:35, as will be shown.

White gives a list of sources from the Nestle-Aland edition for the readings "*Son of Man*" and "*Son of God*" respectively as follow, the main ones beings; P66, P75, ⳨, B, D, W plus a few cursives (or none) versus A, L, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0250, Families 1, 13, 33<sup>9 p 27</sup> ("*queen of the cursives*"), the Majority of Greek manuscripts, most of the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac. The Nestle-Aland format is such that, at first glance, the witnesses look to be about equally divided, thanks in part to the use of the symbol M for the Majority of Greek manuscripts but if the witnesses were listed in full, support for the reading "*Son of Man*" would be shown up for how paltry it actually is.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 107</sup> lists all the sources that White extracts from the Nestle-Aland edition apart from Uncial 070 and Cursive 33 explicitly but he adds 19 uncial manuscripts in favour of "*Son of God*," namely E, F, G, K, S, U, V, X, Y, Γ (Gamma), Δ, Λ (Lambda), Ω, 047, 055, 0124, 0141, 0211, 0233.

Again, it should be noted that the witness of the Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac texts in favour of "*Son of God*" predates the oldest witnesses to "*Son of Man*" i.e. P66, 75, by up to 100 years.

Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 50</sup> also notes Tatian in his Diatessaron, 178 AD, Tertullian, 160-220 AD and Hilary of Potiers, 315-367 AD, i.e. before or contemporaneous with ⳨, B all write "*Son of God*" in John 9:35, with no church fathers writing in support of "*Son of Man*."

Of the modern Greek editions before Westcott and Hort, only Tischendorf<sup>62</sup> has "*Son of Man*" in his text. This was enough to influence Nestle but not for Westcott and Hort's RV, except as a marginal note, which Burgon<sup>13 p 315</sup> rightly dismisses as among the "*corrupt readings of B ⳨.*"

The bibles that prepared and brought in the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation i.e. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup>, all read "*Son of God*" in John 9:35. White cannot allude to any equivalent movement of the Spirit of God with respect to any of the bibles that read "*Son of Man*" in John 9:35.

Nevertheless, White has the audacity to declare that "*The external evidence for Son of Man...is very strong, including the major uncials and papyri. It is very difficult to understand why θεου would be replaced by ανθρωπου ["man"]...however, it is much easier to understand how the very common phrase υιου του θεου ["Son of God"] could replace the other reading...Hence, most textual scholars see "Son of Man" as the almost certain original reading.*"

See Dr Hills's list in **Chapter 5** of *Heretical Readings in Codex Aleph*, which includes "Son of man" in John 9:35. Dr Hills's explanation shows that it is NOT "very difficult to understand why *θεου* would be replaced by *ανθρωπου* ["man"]."

Inspection of any concordance will reveal that the phrase "**Son of God**" occurs 46 times in the New Testament and 47 times in the entire bible, with Daniel 3:25 as the one Old Testament reference, to a pre-incarnate appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ. Daniel 3:25 is of course another verse where the NASV, NIV downgrade the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ with the reading "son of the gods."

Any concordance will also reveal that the expression "**Son of man**" ("Son of Man" as in the NASV, NIV implies Deity with respect to man, which is blasphemous but White chose to ignore this gross error on the part of modern editors) occurs 85 times in the New Testament and 193 times in the entire bible. Many of the Old Testament readings are given as "son of man" but "**Son of man**" is found repeatedly in the Book of Ezekiel, where it obviously does not confer Deity on the addressee.

Neither the scholars nor James White appear to have checked their bibles and White has therefore lied about "the very common phrase *υιου του θεου* ["Son of God"]." It is much less common than the expression "**Son of man.**"

And lying "is not glorifying to God."

Chick Salliby<sup>61 p 19</sup> notes upon comparing the AV1611 and NIV readings for John 9:35 that "Since two verses later Jesus acknowledged that He is this "Son of God," this passage has always served as a valuable proof text of His Deity – but not so in the NIV."

Dr Ruckman<sup>8 p 76, 18 p 109, 141 p 30-1</sup> has detailed explanations as follows with respect to the erroneous substitution of "Son of man" for "**Son of God**" in John 9:35, his emphases.

"John 9:35...The reading is "συ πιστευεις εις τον υιον του θεου," "**Dost thou believe on the Son of God?**" By some peculiar reasoning...the verse has been altered to "πιστευεις εις τον υιον του ανθρωπου" ["Dost thou believe on the Son of man?"]. But what does THAT mean? The only places in the Bible where Jesus Christ ever asked men to **believe on Him**, were places where He professed to be God's Son! (Note John 3:16; 3:36; 5:24; 3:17; 3:35; 6:40; 8:36; 11:4; 17:1, etc.) One of the great critical dictums for correcting the A.V. 1611 Greek manuscripts is that "one should always choose the language and expressions most characteristic of the author." Well, what in the world would possess a man who was acquainted with John's style (in the Gospels), to suddenly write "Son of MAN" where Jesus is dealing with a sinner on matters of **doctrinal belief? Is this characteristic of John?** It isn't in 20 passages, anywhere, in the Gospel of John! "The Son of God" is the correct reading and the ASV, RV, RSV, and all new "bibles" are greatly in error, "**not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.**"

Dr Ruckman continues.

"Nobody in the New Testament was ever asked to believe in the Son of "MAN," and if they did, it wouldn't save them from anything. "**The Son of man**" is Christ's self-chosen designation which He uses in his relationship with the nation of Israel while He is IN THE FLESH (cf. 2 Cor. 5:16). You will notice that the term "**Son of man**" is not even remotely connected with the transactions in John 9. Instead, it is God (v 3), God (v 16), God (v 24), God (v 29), God (v 31), and God (v 33). To find "the Son of MAN" popping up in this context after nine chapters on the Son of God (1:34; 1:49; 3:16; 3:34; 5:17, 20, 21, 22, 23; 8:42, 54, etc.) is a little misplaced. [It is true that the expression occurs in 6:53 and 62; but in both these places the Lord is talking about feeding Israel (see v 32,

45, 49), and He is making reference to the fact that the man talking with them is a **human being** of flesh and blood. They understood HIM exactly as he told it to them (vv 52, 60).]

“Notice, further, that in discussing matters of belief, not once does Jesus Christ tell anyone to “Believe of the Son of man” in John 6, nor does He in John 5:27. The gist of 5:27 is that Christ will be given power to judge earthly men because He Himself has become one of them (see Acts 17:31 by comparison). In John 3:13, 14, notice again how the expression is always used in reference to **an earthly man dying on earth in relation to Israel** (observe “Moses” in John 3:14 for example).

“Now this explains ...why John never tells anyone to believe on the Son of **man**. Observe that every time John mentions faith or belief that saves (1:7, 12; 2:23; 3:15, 16, 18, 36, 6:40; 14:1; 6:35; 11:25; etc.), he has a reference to the Son of **God**. If there were any doubt about this interpretation, observe how the Holy Spirit has preserved in the AV 1611...John’s statement that the purpose for which he wrote the gospel was to get people to believe that Jesus Christ was the “Son of **God**” (John 20:31), not the “Son of **man**.” There is not one case in John’s gospel where any man is promised eternal life for believing that Jesus is the Son of man. The reading of the NASV here is the conjecture of an amateur.

“In spite of the work of dead orthodox apostates, we can still find traces of the correct text (the King James text) in 200 A.D. (writings of Origen), 220 A.D. (writings of Tertullian), and 330 A.D. (Ulfilas’ Gothic Bible).”

Dr Ruckman’s analysis answers White’s charge of “inconsistency” against bible believers – see above – with respect to John 3:13 and his examples of Matthew 9:6, 12:8 which address respectively the Lord’s healing of a man of Israel and His Lordship of Israel’s Sabbath.

White should note that his failure with respect to “**rightly dividing the word of truth**” 2 Timothy 2:15 “*is not glorifying to God.*”

White now returns to his attack on Philippians 2:6-7 – see his opening thrust above, thwarted by Cloud. White insists that the NIV reading “*did not consider equality with God something to be grasped*” should not be taken to mean “*that Christ did not have this equality...with the Father*” because the NIV has “*the plain affirmation...that Jesus Christ was “in very nature God.”*” He also maintains that the AV1611 reading “**thought it not robbery to be equal with God**” is a “*rather awkward translation.*”

White continues, his emphases, “*Here we have the preincarnate Lord, existing eternally in the very form of God, laying aside that equality that He had with the Father so as to give His life for His people. If one does not start with the Lord **having** equality with the Father, the entire example is destroyed. **Not** trying to exalt oneself and become equal with God is hardly an example of humility, but that is what one is left with if one does not recognize that this passage teaches that equality with God was already something that the Lord had prior to His incarnation. The translation of the NASB or NIV in no way suggests any kind of heretical idea.*”

It is ironic that White had to resort to “*the rather awkward translation of the KJV,*” which refers to the Lord Jesus Christ “**being in the form of God**” in his attempt to justify the modern alteration, by reference to “*the preincarnate Lord, existing eternally in the very form of God.*” Why didn’t he use the NIV’s “*in very nature God*”? Did he think that reading wasn’t strong enough for the point he wished to make?



White's statement "*laying aside that equality that He had with the Father so as to give His life for His people*" is surely open to criticism. As Cloud states – see above - with respect to heretical teachers that White claims receive no support from the NASV, NIV readings, one group was known to "*acknowledge that Christ was God in eternity past but that He laid aside His deity in His incarnation. This is a view which is allowed by the rendering of Phil. 2:6,7 in the NIV.*"

Cloud's conclusion is worth repeating.

*"Only an accurate translation of the preserved Text can secure the doctrinal victory in these fierce and complex theological battles so that God's people have a proper understanding of the Person of Jesus Christ. I repeat, no English translation is more Christ-honoring than the King James Version."*

And as Chick Salliby<sup>61 p 12-13</sup> notes, with respect to Philippians 2:6, 7, "*Not only does the NIV misinform the reader in this passage but it also clearly argues against all of the facts. That Jesus believed He was God and equal to His Father, can be evidenced in John 5:18, 23; 8:58; 10:30; 14:9; 20:28, 29; and in a number of other passages.*"

The above 7 verses all refer to the Lord's earthly ministry and contradict White's description of the Lord Jesus Christ "*laying aside that equality that He had with the Father*" while He was on earth.

The NIV reading is of course shared by heretical translations such as the JB. NWT. See *Appendix, Table A1*.

Once again, it should be noted that the bibles that prepared and brought in the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation i.e. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all read with the AV1611 with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ "*being in the form of God*" (Tyndale has "*shape*") and Who "*thought it not robbery to be equal with God*" (Wycliffe has "*raven*" which means plunder or robbery in the context, e.g. "*Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf*" Genesis 49:27a).

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 4</sup> has this analysis in response to White's opinion of Philippians 2:6 in the NASV, NIV.

*"A very important example of White's inability to decipher English syntax occurs in Philippians 2:6. This verse presents Jesus Christ and his deity and equal standing as part of the Trinity. The NIV and some editions of the NKJV deny his deity in the following phrase:*

**NIV**

**KJV**

-----  
*who...did not consider equality  
 with God something to be grasped*

*who...thought it not robbery to be  
 equal with God:*

-----  
*"Evidently the NKJV received so much criticism for rendering this as the NIV does, it changed in recent printings to the KJV reading. In the KJV the 'NOT' modifies the word 'robbery'; in the NIV (and some NKJV), the 'NOT' modifies 'equality'.*

*"To make it clearer, look at a parallel statement.*

*Mrs. Christian...did not consider equality with her husband something to be grasped.*

*Mrs. Lib...did not think it was robbery to be equal with her husband.*

*“The two woman have very different ideas. The Christian woman does not claim equality; woman’s lib does. Clear?”*

Will Kinney<sup>160</sup> has this analysis.

*“Philippians 2:6 Not Robbery to be Equal With God...”*

*“The Similarity of Modern Versions with the Jehovah Witness Version*

*““Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, THOUGHT IT NOT ROBBERY TO BE EQUAL WITH GOD: but MADE HIMSELF OF NO REPUTATION, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.”*

*“The phrase “thought it not robbery to be equal with God”, as found in the King James Bible, clearly teaches that Jesus Christ was in fact God...”*

*““Thought it not robbery to be equal with God” is not only the reading of the King James Bible but also of Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Bishop’s Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1587... Wycliffe, and the NKJV 1982 edition (but not the 1979 NKJV).*

*“By being equal to God, Jesus Christ was not stealing or taking something that did not belong to Him. He was and is equal to God the Father.*

*“However many modern versions give us a rendering that means the exact opposite. I am presently in a discussion with a Jehovah Witness who, of course, denies that Jesus Christ is God. He says: “As for Philippians 2:6, the ambiguity is simply one that is shared by many translators and exegetes. The Harper Collins Study Bible NRSV states that some of the key words used here “had puzzled interpreters” and are “problematic.”*

*“The New World Translation, which the JWs use, says: “although he was existing in the form of God, gave no consideration to a seizure, namely, that he should be equal to God.”*

*“Then [the JW] proceeds to show the readings found in many modern versions.*

*“NASB “ did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped” ...*

*“New Jerusalem Bible “did not count equality with God something to be grasped”...*

*“Revised Version “counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God”...*

*“NKJV 1979 edition “did not consider equality with God something to be grasped.”*

*“NIV “did not consider equality with God something to be grasped.”*

*“Keep in mind that this is a Jehovah Witness who is using these modern versions to support his view that Jesus Christ was not God!*

*“To get a clearer idea of just how different in meaning the phrase is, “thought it not robbery to be equal with God” from “did not consider equality with God something to be grasped” compare the following statements.*

*““The black man thought it not robbery to be equal with the white man.” In other words, he was not stealing something that did not belong to him; he is equal to the white man.*

*““The black man did not regard equality with the white man a thing to be grasped.” He didn’t even try and thought it way beyond him.*

*“The meaning found in the NASB, NIV, NKJV 1979 edition...is totally different from the one found in the King James Bible and others which reveal the full deity of our Lord Jesus Christ.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>17 p 396</sup> has this comment on Philippians 2:6, his emphases.

*““thought it not robbery to be EQUAL with God” (vs 6). The word “harpagmos” (Greek) is an act of robbery (Bullinger, “Companion Bible,” p. 1774), not a “grasping hold on something which someone already HAS...Because the scholars (any, of any persuasion) could not divorce the time element between the two clauses in verse 6, they had to force the Greek word to mean what it does not say. If He had the Deity – AND THAT IS CLEAR! – He didn’t have to “snatch at it violently”...or “clutch” at it...Isn’t it amazing how the AV 1611 translators had all of this figured out ahead of 1900 and without any of the information that the modern editors profess to have?*

*“Plainly, Christ professes equality with God when He is on earth! (John 1:18; 3:13; 5:22; 6:46; 8:58; 9:38). And even plainer, all of His enemies thought He was a God-robber (John 10:33). **THEY CRUCIFIED HIM BETWEEN THIEVES!**”*

White’s preference for the NIV, NASV reading in Philippians 2:6 has led him into heresy. He clearly believes “that equality with God was already something that the Lord had prior to His incarnation” but not during His incarnation because he speaks of the Lord “laying aside that equality,” which bears out Cloud’s warning above.

White then seeks to justify the modern readings in Romans 14:10 and Acts 16:7. See remarks in the previous chapter where each of these verses has been addressed.

White’s thinly-veiled antagonism towards the Holy Bible shows up distinctly in his comments on the next reading of the AV1611 that he attacks, Micah 5:2, where the term “goings forth” has been replaced by “origins” in the NIV – and the JB, NWT. See **Appendix, Table A1**. The faithful precursors to the AV1611, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all read similarly to the AV1611, with “going out,” “goings forth” and “out going” respectively. None of them use the word “origins” in the context, or any word like it.

It is interesting that even the NASV retains the term “goings forth” in Micah 5:2, forcing White to resort to the NIV reading in order to subvert the AV1611 term. Of 19 passages of scripture that White discusses in some detail in this chapter, he uses, or leads with the NASV against the AV1611 in 11 of them, according to this sequence; John 1:18, Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, John 14:14, Colossians 2:9, Acts 17:9, Romans 1:20, Jude 4, Romans 14:10, Acts 16:7, Matthew 1:25.

He uses, or leads with the NIV against the AV1611 in 6 passages of scripture as follows, 1 Timothy 3:16, Mark 1:1, John 9:35, Philippians 2:6-7, Micah 5:2, Luke 2:33.

He uses or leads with NRSV, RSV in 2 passages of scripture as follows, 1 Peter 3:14-15, Isaiah 7:14.

These results show that “multiple translations of the [unspecified] Bible” are certainly important to James White<sup>3 p 7</sup> in his efforts to subvert the Holy Bible, AV1611 in this chapter but the NASV is noticeably his ‘preference,’ which is not surprising given that James White is, or was a paid consultant to the NASV revision committee. See note in **Chapter 3**. However, the NASV definitely let White down in Micah 5:2 and must be clearly in need of ‘revision,’ therefore, so that it matches his apparent ‘preference’ for the NIV in Micah 5:2.

White devotes over two pages of his book to justifying this one particular alteration of Micah 5:2 in the NIV. He appeals to the explanation (excuse) of Dr Kenneth Barker, who is “*the General Editor of the NIV Study Bible and...the Executive Director of the NIV Translation Center.*”

Dr Barker, as quoted by White, his emphases, maintains that “*“The NIV translators were not careless in the handling of Old Testament Messianic prophecies or of any other doctrines but good, godly, spiritual scholars differ on the interpretation of certain biblical passages...the Hebrew text at the end of this verse can be translated either...“goings out are from old, from days of eternity”...or...“origins are from old, from ancient times.””* Dr Barker further maintains that, “*Those who prefer the second translation believe that the expression refers to the ancient “origins” of the Messiah in the line of David (as indicated in the Davidic covenant of 2 Samuel 7) and in the tribe of Judah (Gen. 49:10).*

“*“The majority of the Committee...felt that the **context** favoured the second view “Bethlehem...of Judah, out of **you** [emphasis mine] will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel” (note the emphasis on the origins of the future Davidic ruler in the Davidic town of Bethlehem).””*

Dr Barker insists that, “*“those who favor the second translation still believe in the eternity of the Messiah (and so in the eternal Son of God) and believe that His eternality is clearly taught in other passages, particularly in the New Testament.””*

Dr Barker’s insistence on “*the eternity of the Messiah*” is irrelevant with respect to the NIV translation of Micah 5:2. “*The eternity of the Messiah*” is neither mentioned nor inferred in Micah 5:2 in the NIV. He is also being evasive in his reference to “*other passages.*” “*Other passages*” are *not* the issue. The issue is Micah 5:2 in the AV1611 versus the NIV. Dr Barker’s statement is as outrageous as White’s remark<sup>3 p 161</sup> with respect to the deletion by the modern versions of the phrase “*take up the cross*” in Mark 10:21.

“*Scripture [NIV, NASV] records Jesus’ call to take up the cross in three places, and this is sufficient.*” See **Chapter 7** and related comments. See also **Chapter 6** and Dr Ruckman’s comments in the discussion of “*hell*” and “*hades*” on White’s justification for discarding readings because they are mentioned elsewhere in the scriptures.

Yet, according to White, Dr Barker also insists that he would feel “*honoured*” if he were to be accused of “*being biased towards the deity of Christ.*”

In answer, it must be asserted that regardless of Dr Barker’s sense of honour, or the beliefs of his committee members, the way that they translated the verse in question, Micah 5:2, is decidedly not “*biased towards the deity of Christ.*” Dr Barker states that the committee had a choice between two readings. They chose the one that did *not* refer to “*the eternity of the Messiah*” and relegated the one that *did* to the footnote.

In doing so, they departed from the translation followed by every bible translator in English from the time of Wycliffe to that of the King James translators, including Dr Miles Smith, writer of the AV1611 Preface<sup>8 p 25</sup>, who “*had Hebrew at his fingers’ ends.*” Yet no evidence exists even to suggest that Dr Smith and his colleagues ever seriously countenanced “*the second translation*” that the NIV committee opted for.

And it should be remembered that faithful precursors to the AV1611 – see above – that contained what would become the AV1611 reading for Micah 5:2 were the bibles that God used to bring in the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation. By comparison, Dr Barker’s NIV has brought in nothing.

Nevertheless, in the light of Dr Barker's explanation, White chides "*KJV Only advocates*" for not taking the time "*to actually determine if indeed the translators are anti-Trinitarian, Christ-denying heretics*" and for failing to acknowledge that "*the second reading is supported by solid arguments and has a firm basis in the Hebrew text itself.*"

The second reading is not supported by any "*solid arguments*" or "*firm basis in the Hebrew itself*" that ever persuaded Dr Smith and his colleagues, who did not perceive that the second reading was even worth including in the margin of Micah 5. Moreover, as Dr Barker even admits himself, his so-called "*solid arguments*" are arguments from "*interpretation*" - or even mere supposition, because "*the line of David*" is not mentioned or even implied anywhere in Micah 5. The essence of the chapter is prophetic, beyond the Church Age.

Dr Barker's interpretative approach is therefore, by definition, unacceptable as a basis for rigorous translation. The TBS<sup>103 p 28-31</sup> has noted in some detail this particular shortcoming of the NIV, e.g. with respect to its translation of the word for "*flesh*" e.g. in Romans 7:18 as "*sinful nature.*" Such interpretation leads to a grotesque wording in 1 Corinthians 5:5, where the NIV makes Satan responsible for ridding the sinner of his "*sinful nature*"!

The TBS rightly declares that "*let the word [for "flesh"] be translated as it should be and let the individual Christian study the Scriptures for himself to determine what the passage teaches. Leave preinterpretation to the paraphrasers... Translators [are] not free to build or create their own Greek text based upon their interpretation of a passage; they are only to translate the text that is before them.*"

This is sound advice and in principle equally applicable to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and its translation into English. It is regrettable that neither James White nor Dr Kenneth Barker took any notice of it.

Dr Barker has also confounded the Messianic *line*, which as personified in Joseph, "*was of the house and lineage of David*" Luke 2:4 with the actual *Messiah*, Who can have no 'origin.'

The Jews of Jesus's time understood the distinction much better than either James White or Dr Barker.

***"Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by"*** John 8:58, 59.

But Dr Barker compounds his error with the additional statement concerning "*the origins of the future Davidic ruler in the Davidic town of Bethlehem.*" Although "***Jesus was born in Bethlehem.***" He did not 'originate' in Bethlehem. See John 8:58, 59 above.

White is lying again when he accuses bible believers of not bothering "*to actually determine if indeed the translators are anti-Trinitarian, Christ-denying heretics.*" This issue is secondary with respect to what these translators produced as a 'bible' but bible believers have exercised considerable effort<sup>8 p 300-305</sup> over this issue, e.g. note the TBS.

““Advice was also sought [by the NIV translators] from Jewish, Roman Catholic, and atheistic scholars, according to a news release by the publishers...Attention must also be drawn to the fact that, although the NIV professes to be an evangelical translation, the Greek text on which it is mainly based was not prepared by evangelical scholars but by the editors of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament. The UBS editors included several who deny the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures, working in co-operation

*with a Roman Catholic Cardinal, Carlo Martini. The soundness of a translation which relies upon such a source must be questioned by every one of the NIV's evangelical readers."*

Yet another shortcoming of the NIV consists of its substitution of "ancient times" for the unequivocal word "everlasting." Neither White nor Dr Barker appear to address this inferior substitution but Chick Salliby<sup>61 p 10-11</sup> has noted in his comments on Micah 5:2 that NIV translators were not as convinced about "the eternity of the Messiah" as Dr Barker and James White would have their readers believe, at least not as far as their translation work shows.

*"For Jesus to be Divine, He had to be eternally pre-existent. And for us to know He always existed, we must find proof of this in Scripture. We find this proof in Mic. 5:2...there is not a verse of Scripture that dates God the Father any further back into eternity than this verse dates the Son..."*

*"The words "from everlasting" in the KJV make Christ eternally existent (without a beginning) while the words "from ancient times" in the NIV merely make Him very old – One Whose origin we are left to speculate on [as James White and Dr Barker do]. Is it any wonder than why some finally conclude, as do the Jehovah's Witnesses, that Christ was created?"*

*"While it is painful to evidence such recasting of the truth, please consider carefully these facts: Though the authors of the NIV translated the Hebrew word [olam] "ancient times" in Mic. 5:2, they translated the same Hebrew word "everlasting" when it was used to describe God's love (Ps. 103:17), God's praise (Ps. 106:48), God's righteousness (Ps. 119:142), God's kingdom (Ps. 145:13), God's salvation (Isa. 45:17), God's kindness (Isa. 54:8), God's covenant (Isa. 55:3), God's light (Isa. 60:19), God's renown (Isa. 63:12), etc. – why not then God's Son in Mic. 5:2?"*

*"They also translated [olam] "everlasting" when describing such things as joy, disgrace, disgrace, shame, contempt, a possession, a sign, a name of God's people etc. Strangely, though, when the word was used to describe the name of our "Redeemer" in Isa. 63:16, they translated it this way: "Redeemer from of old is your name." The KJV reads: "redeemer; thy name is from everlasting." Such inconsistency had to be either careless or incompetent – and if neither, then deliberately criminal."*

Dr Barker has insisted – see above - that "The NIV translators were not careless in the handling of Old Testament Messianic prophecies or of any other doctrines." They were therefore either incompetent or deliberately criminal, or both.

Will Kinney<sup>161</sup> has additional comments that corroborate Chick Salliby's observations.

*"Micah 5:2..."*

*"Some modern versions undermine and attack the eternal deity of the only begotten Son of God. Can you prove from the King James Bible that the Lord Jesus Christ had a beginning or an origin? No. Can you prove from the NIV...or the Jehovah Witness versions that He had an origin? Yes..."*

*"The King James Holy Bible - Micah 5:2 "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; WHOSE GOINGS FORTH have been of old, FROM EVERLASTING."*

*"This is the reading - "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" - found in the KJB...Bishop's Bible, Coverdale's Bible, the Geneva Bible..."*

*“Miles Coverdale version 1535 -”And thou Bethleem Ephrata, art litle amonge the thousandes off Iuda, Out off the shal come one vnto me, which shall be ye gouernoure i Israel: whose outgoinge hath bene from the begynnyng, and from euerlastinge”...*

*“The NIV - “But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose ORIGINS are from of old, FROM ANCIENT TIMES”...*

*“The Jehovah Witness version, called the New World Translation, says, “whose ORIGIN is from early times, from the days of time indefinite.”*

*“Why do the NIV...and the JW bibles say “origin”? Christ did not have an origin or a beginning, but He Himself is the beginning, the source of all that exists. Revelation 22:13 tells us, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.” Compare these words spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ with those found in Isaiah 44:6, “Thus saith the LORD, the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.”*

*“The JWs teach that Christ is not eternal God, but rather the first created being, and less by nature than God the Father. The true word of God says, “whose GOINGS FORTH have been from of old, FROM EVERLASTING.” Remember, Christ said: “I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world.”*

*“The KJB says his goings forth are from everlasting. Yet the NIV...[says] his origin is from ancient times. Ancient times may be long, long ago, but it is not the same as everlasting.*

*“The Hebrew word olam can be translated as “ancient” when applied to created things or people as it is in Psalm 22:28, “Remove not the ancient landmark”, or as in Isaiah 44:7, “since I appointed the ancient people”, but when the word is applied to God, it is rendered as “everlasting” as in Psalm 90:2, “from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God.”*

*“The NIV concordance shows that they have translated this word as “everlasting” 60 times, as “eternal” or “eternity” 8 times, as “forever” 202 times, but as “from ancient times” only twice - one of them here in Micah 5:2 where they apply it to our Lord and Redeemer!*

*“As you can see from the King James Bible and those that agree with it, they clearly teach the two natures of the God-man, the Lord Jesus Christ, who would come forth to be ruler in Israel. The first major version to alter the meaning and teach that the Son had an origin was the liberal RSV, which was put together by scholars who did not believe in the full deity of Christ. This version was generally rejected by Fundamentalist Christians as being “too liberal”. Then later the NIV “softened up” the body of Christ with this heretical reading and now the ESV and Holman Standard continue this blasphemy.*

*“I have heard some who try to defend the NIV, ESV reading of “origin” by telling us that His origin refers to His family lineage and they tell us His ancestry is from ancient times. There are two big problems with this explanation.*

*“If the NIV, ESV, Holman versions wanted to communicate this idea, then just come out and say “whose FAMILY LINE is from ancient times”. But they don’t do this.*

*“Secondly, if only the family line is from ancient times, then there is nothing special about the Son of God. Everybody’s family line is from long ago and ancient times. We all come from Adam!!! It can be said of John, Peter, Paul, Joseph or anyone else that*

*their family line is from long ago. So what is so special about this? It wouldn't prove His deity.*

*“But if we say “His goings forth are from everlasting” then we have witness that He is the eternal Son of God, and the two natures of our Redeemer are clearly revealed. You cannot get this from the NIV, ESV, RSV, Holman and JW versions.”*

*As even Dr Barker implicitly agrees, “those who favor the second translation still believe in the eternity of the Messiah (and so in the eternal Son of God) and believe that His eternality is clearly taught in other passages, particularly in the New Testament.”*

*But why did they “favor the second translation” and thereby remove the witness to “the eternal Son of God” from Micah 5:2 in the NIV, given that they repeatedly translated the word *olam* as “everlasting” or similar elsewhere in the Old Testament?*

*Perhaps the answer is to be found in Jeremiah 17:9a.*

***“The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked:”***

*Dr Kenneth Barker is “the General Editor of the NIV Study Bible.” Although they are supporters of the NKJV against the AV1611, Radmacher and Hodges<sup>162</sup> have some interesting disclosures about the NIV Study Bible. AV1611 readings have been substituted for the NKJV readings that Radmacher and Hodges used.*

***“Micah 5:2 and Matthew 2:6***

*“Here again we meet the NIV's striking reluctance to see direct Messianic prophecy in some of the major texts which the New Testament applies to Christ.*

*“To begin with, the NIV text rendering of Micah 5:2 eliminates what has traditionally been perceived by conservatives as a testimony to the eternity of Jesus Christ. NIV translates as follows:*

*““...whose origins are from of old, from ancient times.”*

*“The NIV relegates to a text footnote the alternate translation... “Or “from days of eternity.””*

*“Why did the NIV make this kind of choice? The answer is likely to be, once again, their flawed view of Messianic prophecy.*

*“According to Matthew 2:3-6, when the wise men arrived in Jerusalem inquiring about the birth of the Messiah, Herod turned to the professional circle of Jewish interpreters to find out **“where Christ should be born”** Matthew 2:4. In response, the chief priests and scribes cite Micah 5:2 in support of their claim that Bethlehem was to be His birthplace. This shows that, in the New Testament period, Micah 5:2 was understood and interpreted as a Messianic prophecy.*

*“But the NIV seems frightened of this conclusion. In the Study Bible note to Micah 5:2 we read this:*

*““ruler: Ultimately... Christ, who will rule...for God the Father.”*

*“Why “ultimately”? Whom do the translators suppose is referred to in the first place? We are not told.*

*“Of course, if the NIV regards Micah 5:2 as having only an ultimate reference to Christ, they must leave room for some other – and merely human! – reference. Thus the choice of the rendering “whose origins are...from ancient times” permits the application of the prophecy to someone who is not, in fact, eternal. The translation option which the NIV*



has assigned to its text footnote (“from days of eternity”) would have excluded a human reference for this text.

“The NIV Study Bible note on this point is notably vague:

““origins...from of old. His beginnings were much earlier than his human birth (see John 8:58). from ancient times. Within history (cf. 2 Sa 7:12-16; Isa 9:6-7; Am 9:11), and even from eternity (see NIV text note).”

“What is all this supposed to mean? John 8:58 is cited in support of the statement that “His beginnings were much earlier than his human birth.” But John 8:58 is a declaration about our Lord’s eternal existence [see John 8:58, 59 cited in this context above]...

“If the NIV study note simply is telling us that the person of whom Micah prophesied was “eternal,” why not tell us so clearly? But then, if that is true, why not translate the last part of the verse by “from days of eternity”?

“Is the NIV here trying to glide around a kind of double reference view of Micah 5:2 without ever really telling us so candidly?

“Even more confusing is the study note treatment of “from ancient times” which are explained as “within history.” What is this supposed to mean exactly, and precisely how is it explained by the cited Scripture texts that immediately follow it (2 Samuel 7:11-12; Isaiah 9:6-7; Amos 9:11)? After examining these texts – two of which pertain to Messianic times, and one to the Davidic covenant – the reader will probably still have no inkling of what the NIV study note means by “within history.”

“Furthermore, when the words “within history” are followed by “and even from eternity (see NIV text note),” what is the reader to conclude? Is he to gather that the “NIV text note” and the NIV text translation give us a kind of double meaning for the Hebrew phrase in question? Obviously, clarity is not the strong suit of this particular note!

“Why all this vagueness? Is the NIV trying to be all things to all men here? Why can’t they tell us clearly what they believe about this famous prophetic declaration? Whom does it really refer to, and in what specific way?”

“**For God is not the author of confusion**” 1 Corinthians 14:33a. God is clearly not the Author of the NIV because none of Radmacher and Hodges’s questions receive any satisfactory answer from Dr Barker’s comments that White reproduces.

White’s<sup>3</sup> p 216-218 last verses under attack in this chapter are Isaiah 7:14, Matthew 1:25, Luke 2:33, with respect to the virgin birth of the Lord Jesus Christ.

See **Chapter 7** for the analysis of White’s objections to the term “**firstborn**” in Matthew 1:25 for the AV1611, noting in passing that the bibles of Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all read “**firstborn**” or the equivalent in Matthew 1:25, in agreement with the AV1611.

White cites the modern reading of “a young woman” in Isaiah 7:14, as found in the RSV, compared to “**a virgin**” as the AV1611 reads and “the child’s father and mother” as found in the NIV versus “Joseph and his mother” as the AV1611 reads in Luke 2:33.

White acknowledges that the NIV, NASV each has “*virgin*” in Isaiah 7:14, as does the AV1611, although White fails to appreciate that the significance of the full expression “*the virgin*” in the NIV, NKJV in Isaiah 7:14, as distinct from “**a virgin**” in the AV1611. The expression “*the virgin*” is a step towards New Age doctrine, which embraces ‘the

Virgin,' with 'V' capitalized, of heathen religions, e.g. *"the queen of heaven"* Jeremiah 7:18, 44:17, 18, as Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 108ff</sup> explains.

*"There is a distinction between Mary, the historical mother of Jesus Christ, and this Virgin of the heathen religions... 'The Virgin' of the heathen has found its way into the NIV. The capitalization of the 'V' brings out all sorts of New Age theological possibilities."*

She lists 11 verses in which the NIV substitutes *"the Virgin"* for *"the virgin"* as found in the AV1611, e.g. 2 Kings 19:21 and then shows how a Catholic writer uses these verses as they read in the NIV *"to support 'Mary's Role in God's Plan of Salvation.'"*

White missed all of this in his haste to impugn the AV1611. He insists that, his emphases, *"the KJV is not consistent in its rendering of the Hebrew words that are translated variously as "virgin" or "maid." For example, the KJV renders the more technical term that specifically refers to a virgin, the Hebrew term bethulah, as "maid" in such places as Jeremiah 2:32 and 51:22. But, it also translates the less specific term, almah ["a virgin" in Isaiah 7:14]...as "maid" in Exodus 2:8 and Proverbs 30:19. Hence it is hard to defend the KJV from the charge of irregularity in rendering Hebrew terms...*

*"It should be noted that the Hebrew word almah can properly be translated "young maiden" or "young woman." The question is not of the translation, but of the meaning of the passage at Isaiah 7:14...The physician Luke, who surely would know the specific meaning of terms such as "virgin," uses the Greek term that can **only** mean "virgin" when he speaks of Mary. There is no attempt to "hide" this fact in modern translations, hence, there is no conspiracy to change this teaching..."*

White<sup>3 p 221</sup> has a note associated with the above, where he states that *"Matthew draws directly from the Septuagint's reading of Isaiah 7:14...the specific term meaning "virgin," at Matthew 1:23; Luke likewise uses it at Luke 1:27."*

See Dr Ruckman's detailed analysis<sup>137</sup> that disproves the existence of a pre-Christian Septuagint. Luke 1:27 is not a direct reference to Isaiah 7:14 and both the NIV and NKJV again use the term *"the virgin"* in Matthew 1:23, which is a New Testament citation of Isaiah 7:14, preserving their inclination to New Age doctrine.

The Geneva Bible<sup>49</sup> has *"the virgin"* in Isaiah 7:14 but Wycliffe's<sup>138 Wycliffe</sup> and the Bishops'<sup>138</sup> bibles each have *"a virgin"* – as does Coverdale's<sup>138 Coverdale</sup> Bible. None of these pre-AV1611 bibles translate *almah* as *"young woman"* although the AV1611 does necessarily refine the Geneva's reading *"the virgin,"* which is inappropriate, for the reasons that Dr Mrs Riplinger has given.

If James White was not too proud to learn from Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work, he would have understood that the Satanic New Age attack on the scriptural record of the virgin birth of the Lord Jesus Christ is not restricted to 'hiding' the term *"virgin."* The attack is carried out in a more subtle fashion by exalting *"'The Virgin' of the heathen"* against *"a virgin"* of Isaiah 7:14, Matthew 1:23 in the AV1611, starting with the intermediate reading of *"the virgin"* in the NIV, NKJV – with the NIV moving repeatedly to *"the Virgin"* in less familiar but nevertheless important passages in the Old Testament. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks above.

White is wrong in his accusation of inconsistency against the AV1611 for its translation of *"bethulah, as "maid" in such places as Jeremiah 2:32 and 51:22"* and *"almah...as "maid" in Exodus 2:8 and Proverbs 30:19."* He is also inconsistent himself, with respect to these accusations. Consider the following verses, noting that the AV1611, NIV,

NASV all have “*virgin*” in Isaiah 7:14, even though the NIV, NASV incorrectly use the definite article.

**“*And Pharaoh's daughter said to her, Go. And the maid went and called the child's mother*”** Exodus 2:8. The NIV, NASV each has “*girl*.”

**“*The way of a man with a maid*”** Proverbs 30:19b. The NIV, NASV have “*maiden*” and “*maid*” respectively.

White's accusation against the AV1611 applies equally to the NIV, NASV but he inconsistently omits to accuse the NIV, NASV of “*irregularity*.”

**“*Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? yet my people have forgotten me days without number*”** Jeremiah 2:32. The NIV has “*maiden*” and the NASV has “*virgin*.”

**“*With thee will I break in pieces the young man and the maid*”** Jeremiah 51:22b. The NIV has “*maiden*” and the NASV has “*virgin*.”

Again, White's accusation against the AV1611 applies equally to the NIV but once again, White inconsistently fails to accuse the NIV of “*irregularity*.” Inspection of the above verses shows that the NASV's reading “*virgin*” is inferior in the context. The emphasis in both verses is clearly on the whole person, as an individual, not the person's particular virginal state. Where that particular condition is of central importance, the emphasis changes, as in Luke 1:27, i.e. “*the virgin's name was Mary*.”

However, White's accusations against the AV1611 are wrong, because a “*maid*” in the AV1611 is invariably a “*virgin*.” Consider the following verses.

**“*I took this woman, and when I came to her, I found her not a maid...And, lo, he hath given occasions of speech against her, saying, I found not thy daughter a maid; and yet these are the tokens of my daughter's virginity*”** Deuteronomy 22:14b, 17.

**“*The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin*”** Deuteronomy 32:25. Compare Jeremiah 51:22b above, where the context of God's judgement is similar.

**“*Then said the king's servants that ministered unto him, Let there be fair young virgins sought for the king*”** Esther 2:2.

**“*And he brought up Hadassah, that is, Esther, his uncle's daughter: for she had neither father nor mother, and the maid was fair and beautiful*”** Esther 2:7.

**“*A man and his father will go in unto the same maid, to profane my holy name*”** Amos 2:7b. The statement is prophetic. The young woman was still a “*virgin*” at the time that the Lord made the statement. Observe how the NIV, NASV obscure both the terminology and the prophecy.

Where a more general term is needed, the scripture uses the word “*damsel*,” qualified as necessary to denote a “*virgin*.” Consider these verses.

**“*And the damsel was very fair to look upon, a virgin, neither had any man known her*”** Genesis 24:16. Observe that this verse defines the term “*virgin*.”

**“*And his soul clave unto Dinah the daughter of Jacob, and he loved the damsel, and spake kindly unto the damsel*”** Genesis 34:3.

**“*Then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity unto the elders of the city in the gate*”** Deuteronomy 22:15.

***“If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour's wife”* Deuteronomy 22:23, 24b.**

White’s criticisms of the Holy Bible with respect to the terms “*maid*” and “*virgin*” are therefore both unwarranted and inept.

Dr Paisley<sup>163, p 26ff</sup> has these insightful comments on Isaiah 7:14 and the translation of *almah* as “*virgin*.”

*“The first line of assault of the critics is based upon the Hebrew word ‘almah’, translated in the A.V. ‘virgin’. It is urged that the proper Hebrew word is ‘bethulah’, and that if a virgin was what the prophet wished to signify, he would have used that word. ‘Almah’, it is contended, simply means ‘a young woman of marriageable age’...*

*“In order that the saints, to whom the faith was delivered, might have an answer to such an argument, the Holy Spirit used the word ‘almah’ seven times in the Old Testament, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word might be established. The word ‘almah’ occurs in the following Old Testament verses:-*

*“Genesis 24:43; Exodus 2:8; Psalm 68:25; Proverbs 30:19; Song of Solomon 1:3, 6:8; Isaiah 7:14...*

*“Now, seven, in scripture, is the number of perfection, so the Holy Spirit has given us a perfect guide to the meaning of ‘almah’. Professor J. Gresham Machen, in his scholarly work, ‘The Virgin Birth of Christ’, comments:*

*“‘As a matter of fact, there is no place among the seven occurrences of ‘almah’ in the Old Testament where the word is clearly used of a woman who was not a virgin.’*

*“In his ‘Prophets and Promise’, Professor Willis Beecher says:*

*“‘There is no trace of its use to denote any other than a Virgin.’*

*“Professor James Orr states in his great book, ‘The Virgin Birth of Christ’:*

*“‘The objection from the meaning of ‘almah’ was, as we learn from Justin Martyr, Origen and other fathers, one urged by the Jews against the Christian interpretation of the passage from earliest times, but it may fairly be replied now, as it was then, that if the word does not necessarily bear this meaning of ‘virgin’, it may and usually does bear it. In fact, in all of the six places in which, besides this passage, the word occurs in the Old Testament, it may be contended that this is the meaning.”*

*“Four hundred years ago, Martin Luther issued a challenge: ‘If a Jew, or Christian, can prove to me that in any passage of scripture ‘almah’ means ‘a married woman’, I will give him one hundred florins, although God alone knows where I will find them.’*

*“Luther’s challenge still stands impregnable today.*

*“Dr Robert Dick Wilson, Professor of Semitic Philosophy at Princeton Theological Seminary, wrote an article many years ago in the Princeton Theological Review, entitled, ‘The Meaning of ‘Almah’ in Isaiah 7:14’. Dr Wilson stated his conclusions as follows:*

*“‘Finally, two conclusions from the evidence seem clear; first that ‘almah’ so far as is known, never meant ‘young married woman,’ and secondly, since the presumption in common law and usage was, and is, that every ‘almah’ is virgin and virtuous, until she is proved not to be, we have a right to assume that Rebecca and the ‘almah’ of Isaiah 7:14,*

*and all other 'almahs' were virgin until, and unless, it shall be proven that they were not. If Isaiah 7:14 is a prediction of the Conception, and if the events recorded in Matthew 1:18-25 and Luke 1:26-38 are true, and the Holy Spirit of God did really overshadow the Virgin Mary, all difficulties are cleared away. The language has not the difficulty. The great and only difficulty lies in disbelief of predictive prophecy and in the almighty power of God; or in the desire to throw discredit upon the divine Sonship of Jesus.'"*

Dr Paisley's next comment is in favour of "*the literal reading... 'the virgin'*" from an interpretative aspect and he adduces support from the Septuagint for Isaiah 7:14 as found in the AV1611. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's comment on the reading "*the virgin*" and Dr Ruckman's study *The Mythological Septuagint* for comprehensive analyses of these points.

However, Dr Paisley then includes comments which decisively counter White's insistence<sup>3 p 221</sup>, his emphases, that "*even many **conservative** scholars see in this passage a dual fulfillment, one that was relevant in the days of Isaiah that did **not** involve a virgin birth, and the greater fulfillment in the virgin birth of Christ centuries later.*"

Dr Paisley reviews the supposed fulfillment "*that was relevant in the days of Isaiah,*" which is applied variously to the offspring of Ahaz, Hezekiah and that of "*any young woman who, at that particular time, was conceiving a male child*" and declares "*These theories which seek to explain this birth as an ordinary birth are, to say the least, unconvincing. They bear too much the marks of man's manufacturing. They are only brought forward by prejudiced minds, closed to the supernatural.*"

Dr Paisley has an additional comment on Matthew 1:25, where, in agreement with the NIV, NASV and James White, the REB omits "*firstborn.*"

*"'Firstborn' is deleted, yet 'prototokos' definitely appears in the accepted Greek text. Why drop the important word that is confirmation of the fact that Mary had no children before Christ was born? This is but another slight at the Virgin Birth of Christ."*

White shows that he has one of those "*prejudiced minds*" in his risible efforts to defend the modern alteration of "**Joseph**" to "*father*" in Luke 2:33, the last verse in this chapter that he explicitly attacks. See Wilkinson's remarks on this verse under *The God-Honoured Text of the Reformation and 1611*, which show that Jerome had corrupted his Latin Vulgate by introducing the reading "*father*" in turn from corrupted Greek manuscripts – see below. See also the remarks of Cloud above.

White states of Luke 2:33, his emphases, "*Luke 2:33 is a textual issue as well, though...the charge that is leveled is obvious: the use of "father" rather than "Joseph" lends itself to a denial of the virgin birth, making Jesus the son of Joseph. Yet, given the plain teaching of Luke's gospel that Joseph was **not** the natural father of Jesus (Luke 1:34-35), is it not much more natural to take this term as referring to the **role** of Joseph in Jesus' life?...Are we to believe that Jesus never referred to, or thought of, Joseph as His earthly father, the head of His family on earth? Could this not be a perfectly plausible explanation? Surely it is. Yet, KJV Only advocates are not likely to accept such an explanation. Their certainty that the "modern versions" are up to no good keeps most of them from allowing for such clarification. But in this case, they have no choice. Their own King James Version forces them to abandon Luke 2:33, if they are in the least bit consistent in their arguments.*"

White then quotes Luke 2:48, from the AV1611 where Mary states, "*thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.*"

White then insists that, *“Here, from the very lips of Mary, no less, we have the use of the term ‘father’ of Joseph...This use of ‘father’ by Mary is perfectly consistent with the use of ‘father’ at Luke 2:33, where both Mary and Joseph are in view as a family unit. Also, the KJV itself refers to Joseph and Mary as ‘his parents’ in Luke 2:41. There is absolutely no reason to read into the use of the term ‘father’ a denial of the supernatural nature of the birth of the Messiah...”*

White insists that he has provided *“clarification”* for Luke 2:33. He has not. First, he glosses over the *“textual issue”* which, as Dr Moorman, shows, is considerably in favour of the reading **“Joseph”** in Luke 2:33. The favourable witnesses to **“Joseph”** include the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible<sup>39 p 638</sup>.

Secondly, White alludes to Luke 1:34, 35 in an attempt to illustrate *“the plain teaching of Luke’s gospel that Joseph was not the natural father of Jesus.”* However, Luke 1:34, 35 is not as explicit a statement with respect to the virgin birth of the Lord Jesus Christ as Matthew 1:20, ***“that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.”*** Luke 1:34, 35 requires Luke 2:33 as it reads in the AV1611 for clarification, not the reverse as James White tries to imply.

Thirdly, White’s insistence that the modern reading is correct because it refers *“to the role of Joseph in Jesus’ life”* is mere supposition, with no support from the immediate context whatsoever, because Joseph’s *“role”* as such had hardly begun, insofar as Jesus had only just been born. To paraphrase James White, *“Are we to believe that Jesus ...referred to, or thought of, Joseph as His earthly father, the head of His family on earth?”* while the Lord was yet an infant?

Fourthly, White’s lame appeal to *“the plain teaching of Luke’s gospel”* is not the issue. The issue is the correct reading for Luke 2:33, which White evades.

White’s *“perfectly plausible explanation”* is therefore not merely implausible. It is impossible.

As Chick Salliby<sup>61 p 22</sup> notes, *“Though the Gospel writers called Mary Christ’s ‘mother,’ they never called Joseph Christ’s ‘father,’ except when quoting others who, in conversation, mistakenly called him that. While this can be evidenced in the KJV, that is not always the case in the NIV.”*

Salliby then compares the AV1611 and NIV readings for Luke 2:33 and continues.

*“Replacing the word ‘Joseph’ with the word ‘father’ in the verse, injures the doctrine of the virgin birth as much as it would injure the doctrine of creation if one were to replace the word ‘God’ with the word ‘angels’ in Gen. 1:1. Needless to say, such a rewording of Gen. 1:1 would be impossible to accept – So is Luke 2:33 in the NIV.”*

Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 161</sup> would agree, declaring the reading *“father”* in Luke 2:33, RV, to be *“a depravation of the text.”*

However, White then asserts that the modern reading of *“father”* must be accepted without reservation because *“from the very lips of Mary, no less, we have the use of the term ‘father’ of Joseph”* in Luke 2:48. Aside from the fact that Mary is unlikely to have used her husband’s forename when addressing her child<sup>8 p 341</sup>, especially in public, a practice that continues in English-speaking countries to this day, White’s near-papist adulation for Mary overlooks what issues from the very lips of Jesus in the very next verse.

***“And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?”*** Luke 2:49.

Note the capitalization of “**Father’s**” in contrast to the lower case term “**father**” in verse 48 and the fact, in contrast to White’s supposition above, that the Lord’s use of the term “**my Father**” as in Luke 2:49 is *never* applied to Joseph in scripture – something else that White overlooked.

As Dr Ruckman<sup>128 p 43-4</sup> states, his emphases, “*Let us understand what we are talking about. We are saying that the King James Bible is true to the exaltation of Jesus Christ, and that this exaltation has a foundation in Greek manuscript evidence. Don’t forget that. Don’t take it lightly. When these new translations say, in Luke 2:33, “His father and mother,” then they can in no way claim to be superior translations, or even equal translations, in regards to the true Bible standard; for the Bible standard, in both testaments, is the exaltation of Jesus Christ. No one seeking to exalt Him would say that the Holy Spirit led Luke to record that “Joseph” was His father! Mary makes this mistake in her speech and Christ corrects her, immediately, **right in the same chapter!** (See verses 48-50.)*”

Dr Ruckman thus shows that, contrary to White’s opinion, Mary’s use of the term “**father**” in verse 48 is not consistent with the (erroneous) use of the word “**father**” in Luke 2:33 because verse 48 is Mary’s reported speech, whereas as Dr Ruckman<sup>141 p 36-7</sup> rightly states, his emphases, “*Here some depraved blasphemer has told us that “Joseph” was the “father” of Jesus Christ. This ancient depravation, which came from the Jesuit Bible of 1582 and was preserved in its sister corruptions (the ASV 1901 and the RV 1884), is preserved in the NASV in spite of the clear statement of the Lord Jesus Himself, in the context, that His Father’s house was a temple – **not a carpenter’s shop** (Luke 2:49)...*

*“The Lockman Foundation will alibi that Mary called Joseph his “father” in verse 48; but...**Mary is covering up for a birth record which the Pharisees knew (John 8:41) when she calls Joseph His “Father.”** Luke 2:33 [and verse 43] is the direct statement of a licensed physician speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.”*

As is Luke 2:41, as shown in this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 341</sup>, in response to the attack of ‘our critic’ on Luke 2:33, which is similar to that of James White, who also overlooked the Lord’s lineage.

*“At least ONE Biblical reference to Joseph and Mary as the Lord’s “**parents**,” Luke 2:41, would be quite in order to illustrate the fact that they were all of the same PARENTAGE. Joseph “**was of the house and lineage of David**” Luke 2:4, Matthew 1:1-17 as indeed was Mary, Luke 3:23-31 and the Lord Himself, Luke 3:23, Matthew 1:16. At least one such reference is necessary to substantiate the claim that the Lord has on “**the throne of his father David**.” Luke 1:32-33. See also Luke 2:27.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 108-109</sup> states further that, his emphasis, “*Luke 2:33. The God-honoured text says: “και Ιωσηφ και μητηρ αυτου.” “And Joseph and his mother...” But someone wanted you to think that a Medical Physician (Dr Luke) believed that Joseph was the real father of Jesus Christ! So the author of the fifth column of the Hexapla set the verse up for Eusebius to copy as “ και ην ο πατηρ και η μητηρ”...*

*““His father and his mother” would not be the opinion of someone trying to protect someone else – as Luke 2:48 **plainly** is – it would have to be the Holy Spirit guiding the pen of the author of Luke’s gospel. The reading is inexcusable...No Christian would have thought for a moment that Luke would recognize Joseph as the “father” of Jesus Christ, and a truly objective observer would have read Luke’s account of Luke 1:29-35, and considered it when approaching a choice of manuscripts for the reading of Luke 2:33.”*

In short, contrary to White's notion that "*There is absolutely no reason to read into the use of the term "father" a denial of the supernatural nature of the birth of the Messiah...*" several good reasons exist so to do.

More will emerge as further textual evidence is considered – see note above on the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible. It should also be noted<sup>8 p 69</sup> that the bibles of Rome and Wachtower, the DR, JR, JB, NWT, all agree with the NIV, NASV and James White in changing "**Joseph**" to "*father*" in Luke 2:33. See also **Appendix, Table A1**. Again, White is in good company.

Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford<sup>62</sup> all favour the reading "*father*," in turn influencing Nestle and Westcott and Hort's RV.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> and Tyndale<sup>47</sup> have "*father*" in Luke 2:33, the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops'<sup>138</sup> bibles have "**Joseph**," correcting the deficiency in those earlier translations.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 86-7</sup> gives the major textual evidence for "**Joseph**" in the AV1611 as uncials A, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Y, X, Γ, Δ, Θ, Λ, Π, Ψ, Xi (Chi), Ω, 053, 055, 0130, 0211 and possibly 0233, i.e. 22-23 uncials, almost all of the cursives plus Family 13 and 12 out of 14 of the Old Latin witnesses plus the Peshitta Syriac and the Gothic – see above. Most of the Greek witnesses, both uncial and cursive, are from the 8<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>9 p 22-5</sup> but as the 2<sup>nd</sup> century texts of the Old Latin and Peshitta<sup>9 p 28-9, 33-4</sup> affirm, they have, as is usually the case with the Greek sources, faithfully preserved the Traditional Text as found in the AV1611 from apostolic times.

The 13+ Medieval manuscripts of Family 13 have been described earlier as exhibiting a 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century text. Their witness to the AV1611 reading outnumbers that of the 5+ manuscripts of their sister Family 1, which have the modern reading in Luke 2:33, by over 2:1. Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 27-8</sup> has shown that this ratio is typical for Families 1, 13 for the major doctrinal passages that he has examined (overall 3:1).

In favour of the modern reading "*father*," in addition to Family 1, are the usual suspects; ⱼ, B, D, L, W, a few or none of the cursives and 2 of the Old Latin sources.

Tatian<sup>130 p 25, 30-1, 45</sup> also cites the AV1611 reading in 170 AD, long before the oldest Greek witnesses in favour of the modern reading and 2 centuries before the only other father cited with respect to Luke 2:33, Cyril of Jerusalem, who quotes the modern reading.

With the weight of witnesses so overwhelmingly in favour of the AV1611 reading "**Joseph**" in Luke 2:33, it is not surprising that White evaded "*the textual issue*" with respect to this verse.

Luke 2:43, the companion passage to Luke 2:33 and which also reads "**Joseph**" enjoys the same preponderance of evidence in favour of the AV1611. The evidence against the AV1611 reading, i.e. in favour of the modern reading "*father*," is as flimsy as it is for "*father*" in Luke 2:33.

White<sup>3 p 219</sup> concludes this chapter with a summary justification of his attacks on the Deity of Christ. His comments are the usual concoction of half-truths, distortions and outright falsehood.

He accuses bible believers of "*using an important doctrine as a brickbat to further their promotion of the KJV*" and declares that, "*Such is surely not a proper use of such an important Christian belief.*"



Bible believers have in fact sought to reprove “*the unfruitful works of darkness*” Ephesians 5:11 consisting of the modern versions, which have denigrated the doctrine of the Deity of Christ by means of corrupt sources that repeatedly conflict with the bibles of the English Reformation that produced the AV1611 but which form the basis of heretical translations such as the JB, NWT, with the NIV, NASV repeatedly agree, *against* the AV1611.

White then accuses bible believers of producing arguments that are “*utterly inconsistent and most often circular.*” The information provided in this chapter has come from genuine researchers, reputable sources and valid comparison of “*spiritual things with spiritual*” i.e. scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13b. It is neither “*inconsistent*” nor “*circular.*”

White continues.

*“Modern translations such as the NIV and NASB have been cleared of the accusations against them...by examination of the facts themselves.”*

They have not. See above.

But White insists further that, “*we have often seen that passages that do testify to the deity of Christ...are often translated more clearly in the modern translations than in the KJV.*”

They are not, as the preceding pages in this chapter show.

White concludes dogmatically, “*Followers of the prophets of KJV Onlyism are, therefore, less prepared to defend the faith than those who have not limited themselves to a single English translation from the seventeenth century.*”

No such supposed ‘limitation’ has been imposed in this chapter, as inspection of the preceding pages will reveal.

In short, White’s sixth and last main postulate, namely that the modern translations do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, has been found to be as false as his five preceding postulates. See remarks under *White’s Main Postulates Refuted* and those leading up to those at the ends of *Chapter 3*, *Chapter 4* and *Chapter 6*.

Some summary results are reproduced here to give the lie to White’s assertions above. They address the main points of White’s chapter as follows.

1. White<sup>3 p 194-5</sup> tabulates 23 verses, which he uses to ‘prove’ an “*“expansion of piety”*” on the part of manuscripts underlying the AV1611.

The 23 verses in White’s list include 25 references to “*Jesus,*” “*Christ,*” “*the Lord*” and “*Jesus Christ.*”

The NIV omits 21 references, the 1977 NASV omits all 25 references, the current online NASV omits 23 references and the Vulgate omits 21 references. This result strongly indicates that the NIV and NASV are Catholic bibles like the Vulgate, although the NASV omits even more of the Lord’s names and titles than the Vulgate and only slight adjustments have been made in the latest edition.

Wycliffe’s Bible supports the AV1611 in 13 of the 23 verses and in 15 of the 25 references. Tyndale’s Bible supports the AV1611 in 22 of the 23 verses and in 24 of the 25 references. The Geneva and Bishops’ bibles support the AV1611 in all 23 verses and all 25 references.

As indicated, White's assertion that *"the terms "Lord" and "Christ" are used with great frequency in the non-Byzantine texts of the New Testament (a fact that KJV Only writers do not wish to communicate in their works)"* is an outrageous lie, according to the data in his chart.

It should be noted again that the faithful precursors to the AV1611 that mostly support the AV1611 in these 23 verses were the bibles that God used to prepare and bring in the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation. By contrast, God has ignored *"the non-Byzantine texts of the New Testament"* that White favours. His supposed 'proof' of 'expansions of piety' is a lie.

2. White<sup>3 p 197</sup> uses the bogus chart of D. A. Carson, in order to assert that *"that the NIV provides the clearest translations of the passages that teach the deity of Christ; the NASB just a bit less so and the KJV the least of the three..."*

Note Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>14 p 369-371</sup> detailed refutation of Carson's (and White's) bogus chart, with respect to 3 of the 5 passages where the AV1611 supposedly does not testify to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ or is *"least clear"* in this respect, plus 2 Thessalonians 1:12. The remaining 2 passages, Philippians 2:6, Colossians 2:9 will be addressed subsequently.

*"The KJV's four out of eight verses marked 'No', to which Carson points to support his claim that "the KJV missed half" of the verses on Christ's deity, prove to be straw men which fall with a touch of scholarly inspection.*

1. John 1:18<sup>14 p 339, 342</sup> *The term "the only begotten Son" is seen in the vast majority of MSS and is witnessed to the earliest extant record of John 1:18, Tertullian in A.D. 150...The word 'only begotten' emphasises too strongly the distinction between Jesus Christ, the begotten Son, and believers who are adopted sons. "Only begotten" also flattens any New Age assertion that Jesus is one in a long line of avatars. The 'censored' versions stand ready to support those unscriptural schemers who subscribe to a Son who was not 'begotten'.*

*"He, Jesus, is the unique Son of God...but there have been lots of others like him...he was a guide and I can be just like him" New Ager.*

*"The only Son, Jesus is mankind's Saviour. The second advent of Jesus is in Korea" Reverend Moon.*

*"The Spirit of Eternity is One...God the Mother is omniscient...The only Son is Christ, and Christ is Love" The Aquarian Gospel of Jesus Christ...*

*"The jarring tone of 'Christians' harmonising with cultists is confounding. (Recall that Palmer hand picked the members of the NIV committee and had the final say on all translations.)*

*"The Holy Spirit did not beget the Son" Edwin Palmer NIV Committee Executive Secretary."*

2. 2 Thessalonians 1:12: ALL versions read **"our God and the Lord Jesus Christ."** The originator of the chart thinks a comma should be added (after "God"). (Author's note: I believe that Dr Mrs. Riplinger means that the "and" in the clause should be replaced by a comma.)
3. Titus 2:13: ALL Greek texts have the wording of the KJV, **"God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."** None render it as the new versions do.

4. *2 Peter 1:1 Lewis Foster, NIV and NKJV committee member, reveals WHY new version editors insert Christ's deity in Peter and Titus, yet removed it (in) nearly 100 other places. "Some would point out that in passages Titus and 2 Peter, the expression of the deity of Christ has been strengthened by renderings even in liberal translations. What many do not realize is that even here the strong affirmation of deity is used to serve a purpose. The liberal translator ordinarily denies that Paul wrote Titus or that Peter wrote 2 Peter. He points to the very language deifying Jesus as an indication of the later date of these epistles when Paul and Peter could not have written them."*
5. *2 Thessalonians 1:12, Titus 2:13, and 2 Peter 1:1 are called "hendiades," from the Greek "hen, dia dyoin," 'one by two'. Grammatically it is the "expression of an idea by two nouns connected by "and", instead of by a noun and an adjunct. It would be like introducing one's spouse as "my wife and best friend."*

And as this author<sup>8 p 308</sup> adds, *"The AV1611 reading in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 is actually a superior testimony to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ than the NIV variation. "Our God," NIV, simply designates the Lord as God of the Christians. The expression "God and our Saviour", AV1611, shows that the Lord is GOD universally but effectually the Saviour of the Christian. Doctrinally, the Lord is, of course, "Saviour of the world" John 4:42."*

3. White discusses 19 passages of scripture in detail in order to 'prove' that<sup>3 p 219</sup> *"that passages that do testify to the deity of Christ...are often translated more clearly in the modern translations than in the KJV,"* to 'prove' that bible-believing support for these passages as they read in the AV1611 is *"utterly inconsistent and most often circular"* and to 'clear' the NIV, NASV *"of the accusations made against them."*

The following tables, Tables 2, 3, have been constructed to answer White's supposed 'proofs' by simply summoning the witnesses for and against the AV1611 readings for these 19 passages. The reader can then decide for himself which of these bodies of witnesses God has honoured and which He has not – and which are more honouring to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Of Philippians 2:6, note the analysis of Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 4</sup> in response to White's opinion of the NASV, NIV reading.

*"A very important example of White's inability to decipher English syntax occurs in Philippians 2:6. This verse presents Jesus Christ and his deity and equal standing as part of the Trinity. The NIV and some editions of the NKJV deny his deity in the following phrase:*

**NIV**

**KJV**

-----

<i>who...did not consider equality with God something to be grasped</i>	<i>who...thought it not robbery to be equal with God:</i>
---	---

-----

*"Evidently the NKJV received so much criticism for rendering this as the NIV does, it changed in recent printings to the KJV reading. In the KJV the 'NOT' modifies the word 'robbery'; in the NIV (and some NKJV), the 'NOT' modifies 'equality'.*

*"To make it clearer, look at a parallel statement.*

*Mrs. Christian...did not consider equality with her husband something to be grasped.*

*Mrs. Lib...did not think it was robbery to be equal with her husband.*

*“The two woman have very different ideas. The Christian woman does not claim equality; woman’s lib does. Clear?”*

On White’s excuse for the modern reading in Colossians 2:9, note again Dr Ruckman’s<sup>1 p 257-8</sup> incisive comments.

*““Godhead” (Acts 17:29; Col. 2:9; and Rom. 1:20). Here, Jimbo tells us that a person who uses an RSV or NRSV or an NIV or a NASV, “will be in a better position to explain these passages than one UTILIZING [Scholarship Only advocates BELIEVE nothing: they “utilize” translations] only the KJV.”*

*“Well, we’re waiting. Where is the explanation? If you and your buddies are “in a better position” to explain something, for heaven’s sake “share with us” your “vast better understanding of the Scriptures!” Well? Is this dude telling you that more than seventy men on four committees (RSV, NRSV, NIV, and NASV) could not produce even TWO “explanations” for the “Godhead” in the three verses cited from the AV (1611)? You call that “evidence?” You never got a more irresponsible, wild, irrational, **lying assertion** in all your life. **Lying** is as natural to a Scholarship Only advocate as scratching his head: they make their living (\$\$\$) by lying.*

*“With 14,000,000 suckers using NIVs and NASVs, not one of them produced four pages on those three verses, so that any other sucker would get a “better understanding” of the Godhead (the Trinity). What was the point in **altering** the God-honoured texts when you didn’t **believe** them to start with, couldn’t **improve** on them by **changing them**, and then couldn’t exegete **your own TEXT** after you **altered it**? Why these creeps would alter the “original, verbally inspired autographs” the moment they got their hands on them, if they ever did get their hands on them: they think they are **gods**. By the way, the NASV did NOT translate the three words (Acts 17; Col. 2; Rom. 1) in question three different ways. Jimmy lied again. The NASV translated “Theios” (θειος) and “Theiotos” (θειοτης) as “DIVINE NATURE.” The “article” had nothing to do with the translation of the Greek words at all...The NIV and the NASV (and the men who recommend them) are about as trustworthy as Jehudi (Jer. 36).”*

**Table 2**  
**Scripture Comparison for the Deity of Christ, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles**

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Isaiah 7:14	<i>a virgin</i>	<i>a virgin</i> <sup>note 2</sup>	<i>the virgin</i>	<i>a virgin</i>	<i>a virgin</i>
Micah 5:2	<i>going out</i>	<i>outgoing</i> <sup>note 2</sup>	<i>goings forth</i>	<i>out going</i>	<i>goings forth</i>
Matthew 1:25	<i>first begotten</i>	<i>first</i>	<i>firstborn</i>	<i>firstborn</i>	<i>firstborn</i>
Mark 1:1	<i>the Son of God</i>	<i>the Son of God</i>	<i>the Son of God</i>	<i>the Son of God</i>	<i>the Son of God</i>
Luke 2:33	<i>father</i>	<i>father</i>	<i>Joseph</i>	<i>Joseph</i>	<i>Joseph</i>
John 1:18	<i>only begotten Son</i>	<i>only begotten Son</i>	<i>only begotten Son</i>	<i>only begotten Son</i>	<i>only begotten Son</i>
John 9:35	<i>Son of God</i>	<i>Son of God</i>	<i>Son of God</i>	<i>Son of God</i>	<i>Son of God</i>
John 14:14	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>
Acts 16:7	<i>spirit of Jesus</i>	<i>Spirit</i>	<i>Spirit</i>	<i>Spirit</i>	<i>Spirit</i>
Acts 17:29	<i>godly thing</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>
Romans 1:20	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>
Romans 14:10	<i>throne of Christ</i>	<i>judgment seat of Christ</i>	<i>judgment seat of Christ</i>	<i>judgment seat of Christ</i>	<i>judgment seat of Christ</i>
Phil. 2:6	<i>raven</i>	<i>robbery</i>	<i>robbery</i>	<i>robbery</i>	<i>robbery</i>
Colossians 2:9	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>	<i>Godhead</i>
1 Tim. 3:16	<i>that thing</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>God</i>
Titus 2:13	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>
1 Peter 3:15	<i>Lord Christ</i>	<i>Lord God</i>	<i>Lord God</i>	<i>Lord God</i>	<i>Lord God</i>
2 Peter 1:1	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>
Jude 4	<i>Only a Lord, our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<i>God the only Lord and our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<i>God the only Lord, and our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<i>God which is the only Lord, and our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<i>only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ</i>
With AV	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>
% with AV	<b>68</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes:

1. Spelling is as in the AV1611, except where the wording differs appreciably.
2. Coverdale's Bible is used instead of Tyndale's in Isaiah 7:14, Micah 5:2.
3. Readings that differ essentially from the AV1611 are shaded.

The 19 passages of scripture in Table 2, consisting of 19 verses, generate 76 readings in total. Table 2 shows that the pre-AV1611 bibles, on average, support the AV1611 in 65 readings, or 86%. The AV1611 corrects the few residual deficiencies in the earlier versions, which nevertheless largely honour the Lord Jesus Christ in the selected passages that James White uses to focus on *The Son of God, the Lord of Glory*, his Chapter 8.

Table 2 shows further that over the last 600+ years since the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the AV1611 represents a refinement over its predecessors, which nevertheless God used to prepare and implement the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation, of which the AV1611 is the crowning achievement.

Table 3 follows, comparing the AV1611 and the post-1611 bibles, for the same 19 passages of scripture.

Table 3

## Scripture Comparison for the Deity of Christ, AV1611 and Post-1611 Bibles

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
Isaiah 7:14	<i>the virgin</i>	<i>a virgin</i>	<i>the maiden</i>	<i>the maiden</i>	<i>a virgin</i>
Micah 5:2	<i>origins</i>	<i>goings forth</i>	<i>origin</i>	<i>origin</i>	<i>goings forth</i>
Matthew 1:25	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>firstborn</i>
Mark 1:1	<i>the Son of God</i>	<i>the Son of God</i>	<i>the Son of God</i>	OMIT	<i>the Son of God</i>
Luke 2:33	<i>father</i>	<i>father</i>	<i>father*</i>	<i>father</i>	<i>Joseph</i>
John 1:18	<i>God the Only (Son)<sup>note 3</sup></i>	<i>only begotten God</i>	<i>the only Son</i>	<i>only begotten god</i>	<i>only begotten Son</i>
John 9:35	<i>Son of Man</i>	<i>Son of Man</i>	<i>Son of Man</i>	<i>Son of Man</i>	<i>Son of God</i>
John 14:14	<i>ask me anything</i>	<i>ask Me anything</i>	<i>ask for anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>
			<i>DR, JR ask me anything</i>		
Acts 16:7	<i>Spirit of Jesus</i>	<i>Spirit of Jesus</i>	<i>Spirit of Jesus*</i>	<i>spirit of Jesus</i>	<i>Spirit</i>
Acts 17:29	<i>divine being</i>	<i>Divine Nature</i>	<i>the deity*</i>	<i>Divine Being</i>	<i>Godhead</i>
Romans 1:20	<i>divine nature</i>	<i>divine nature</i>	<i>deity*</i>	<i>Godship</i>	<i>Godhead</i>
Romans 14:10	<i>God's judgment seat</i>	<i>judgment seat of God</i>	<i>judgment seat of God</i>	<i>judgment seat of God</i>	<i>judgment seat of Christ</i>
Phil. 2:6	<i>equality</i>	<i>equality</i>	<i>equality</i>	<i>equal with</i>	<i>robbery</i>
Colossians 2:9	<i>Deity</i>	<i>Deity</i>	<i>divinity</i>	<i>divine quality</i>	<i>Godhead</i>
1 Tim. 3:16	<i>He</i>	<i>He</i>	<i>He*<sup>note 4</sup></i>	<i>He</i>	<i>God</i>
Titus 2:13	<i>our great God and Saviour</i>	<i>our great God and Savior</i>	<i>our great God and saviour</i>	<i>the great God and of the Savior of us</i>	<i>the great God and our Saviour</i>
1 Peter 3:15	<i>Christ as Lord</i>	<i>Christ as Lord</i>	<i>the Lord Christ*</i>	<i>the Christ as Lord</i>	<i>Lord God</i>
2 Peter 1:1	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Savior</i>	<i>our God and Saviour*</i>	<i>our God and the Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>

**Table 3, Continued**  
**Scripture Comparison for the Deity of Christ, AV1611 and Post-1611 Bibles**

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
Jude 4	<i>Jesus Christ our only Sovereign and Lord</i>	<i>our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ</i>	<i>only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ*</i>	<i>only Owner and Lord, Jesus Christ</i>	<i>only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ</i>
With AV	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2/10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>
% with AV	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11/53</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes:

1. An asterisk\* indicates agreement of the DR, JR (Challoner's Revision, 1749-52) with the JB against the AV1611, although the actual wording may differ slightly between the Catholic versions. Otherwise, the DR, JR agrees with the AV1611, except in John 14:14.
2. NIV, NASV, JB, NWT readings that agree with the AV1611 are shaded.
3. The current online NIV has "*God the One and Only.*"
4. The DR, JR has "*which*" in 1 Timothy 3:16.
5. The first figure at the bottom of the JB\* column is for the JB, the second for the DR, JR.

Table 3 shows that of the 76 readings in total for the NIV, NASV, JB, NWT, these new bibles agree *against* the AV1611 on average in 68, or 89%. The DR, JR agrees with the AV1611 in 10 of the passages, or 53%, i.e. it agrees with the NIV, NASV, JB, NWT against the AV1611 in 9 of the 19 passages or 47%. The new bibles clearly represent a move away from the God-honoured texts of the English Protestant Reformation and the AV1611 and a regression to the papist texts of the Dark Ages and the heretical sects of Watchtower and those even as far back as the apostolic age, "*which corrupt the word of God*" 2 Corinthians 2:17a.

See Wilkinson's remarks under *Early Conspirators and Corrupters*.

In sum, the modern translations have therefore *not* been "*vindicated again*" according to White's opinion. As indicated at the end of *Chapter 2*, they are instead again found to be like Belshazzar of old.

**"TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting"** Daniel 5:27.

And yet more evidence has therefore emerged that refutes White's sixth and last postulate. The modern versions *do* attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Table 3 shows clearly that they do *not* honour the Lord Jesus Christ after the manner of the pre-1611 bibles and the AV1611 in the passages that White selected, in his vain efforts to prove the reverse.



### Chapter 9 – “Problems in the KJV”

Although he claims<sup>3 p 223</sup> that he “*is not “anti-KJV,”*” James White uses this chapter to find fault with the AV1611 in another 20 verses that he addresses in detail and with respect to numerous other passages in outline.

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 203-204, 437</sup> rightly comments, his emphases, “*When White says “This book is not against the King James Version,”*<sup>3 p vi, 223</sup> *he is wasting the time to lie, for anyone reading his book would find that he heartily recommends two conflicting versions that alter the KJV in more than 60,000 words, calls the AV a “monument,”*<sup>3 p 82</sup> *says it is awkward and inconsistent,*<sup>3 p 212, 230</sup> *that it is “misleading”*<sup>3 p 226</sup> *and that it is responsible for heretical CULTS*<sup>3 p 137</sup>. *Not ONCE, in 271 pages, did he say that the AV was “the word of God” or “God’s truth” or “the Scriptures” of the “Holy Bible,” or “the words of God” or “the truth.” He didn’t even SUGGEST it. He did imply that some missing “Scriptures” were God’s truth*<sup>3 p vii, 12, 95, 116, 247-8</sup>. *So the best and most faithful reproductions of the truth were 5 to 200 Laodicean English translations (that is how many have been published since 1880) which alter that book (the one he was engaged in getting rid of) in 20,000 to 60,000 places.*

*“Someone is lying like an asphalt highway...”*

*“What Book is White’s book against? Ever think about THAT? Did you count the number of times he attacked x and B? Westcott and Hort? Aland and Nestle? The NASV and the NIV? The RSV and the NRSV? What is his book written against? Under pretence of informing “men and women” who love “honesty and truth,”*<sup>3 p 13</sup> *what information did he give you? Was it truth?”* White did not give the “truth” about x and B. He did not give the “information” about x and B, either. See remarks in **Chapter 3**.

Returning to this chapter, White then accuses “*KJV Only advocates*” i.e. bible believers, of making “*claims regarding the KJV that are simply untrue,*” i.e. that “*the KJV is inspired and inerrant.*”

White<sup>3 p 238</sup> has a note to the effect that “*I fully believe the Word of God is inerrant*” but, again, he fails to inform the reader where “*the Word of God*” that is “*inerrant*” can be found between two covers. He gave neither the “truth” nor the “information” about “*the Word of God*” that is “*inerrant*” in this respect.

With reference to “*the plain errors in the AV,*” White insists, his emphasis, that “*the demonstration of errors in that translation effectively...ends the debate*” and that “*In this chapter we wish to focus upon the specific problems in the KJV translation,*” apparently in addition to those he has raised in his Chapter 6. See **Chapter 6 – “Translational Differences.”**

See also **Appendix, Table A1**, where the AV1611 readings that White attacks in this chapter are compared with the NIV, DR, JR, JB, NWT.

White then makes a generous allowance for the “*great scholars...who worked on the translation of the AV.*” White assures his readers with respect to the King’s men that “*I really doubt they would take the slightest offense (sic) to (sic) a reasoned critique of their work.*”

White should re-read the words of Dr Miles Smith<sup>26</sup>, author of *The Translators to the Reader*. Dr Smith does not appear to have made any allowance for any kind of “*critique,*” certainly not any put forward by James White.

*“Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, (Genesis 26:15) neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews (Jeremiah 2:13). Others have labored, and ye may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...neither yet with Esau sell your birthright for a mess of pottage (Hebrews 12:16).”*

Continuing with his “*mess of pottage*,” White’s first attack is on Mark 6:20, where he asserts that the AV1611 reading “**observed him**” should be “*kept him safe*” as in the NASV or “*protected him*” as in the NIV – and the DR, JR, JB, NWT.

White insists that, “*The Greek term simply does not mean “observe,” but instead means “to protect.” One might possibly suggest that “observe” once meant “to protect,” but such seems a long stretch, especially since the KJV renders the same word “preserve” at Matthew 9:17 and Luke 5:38.*”

Inspection of the context of Matthew 9:17 and Luke 5:38 reveals why the AV1611 has “**preserved**” in these verses. The NIV, NASV, along with the JB, NWT omit “**and both are preserved**” from Luke 5:38, obscuring the reason for putting new wine into new bottles – all of which White omitted to tell his readers.

The marginal readings in the AV1611 for “**observed**” in Mark 6:20, to which readings White<sup>3 p 77</sup> had earlier attached considerable importance but which he ‘inconsistently’ fails to mention here, are “*kept him*” or “*saved him*,” showing that the King’s men were aware of the range of meanings of “*the Greek term*,” which the NASV appears to have amalgamated with “*kept him safe*,” perhaps in the hope of covering all the possibilities.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has “*kept*,” Tyndale<sup>47</sup> and the Bishops<sup>138</sup> have “*gave him reverence*” and the Geneva<sup>49</sup> has “*reverenced*.” By inspection, these readings are all closer to the AV1611 reading “**observed**” than to those of the modern versions, “**For Herod feared John**” enough for the king to start putting his own life in order, before the murderous Herodias intervened, verses 24-28..

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 163</sup> explains further why the King’s men rightly used “**observed**” in Mark 6:20 and why the modern alternatives are incorrect. References have been updated.

*“The reading “protected him” is said to be “ridiculous” by Dr. Ruckman<sup>18 p 220</sup>, who poses the extremely pertinent question “Wouldn’t John have been safer in the wilderness with his converts?” Herod’s “protection” was extremely dubious. It consisted of IN-CARCERATION, verse 17, followed by DECAPITATION, verse 16.*

*“However,<sup>18 p 148-149</sup> “observed” matches the rest of the verse: “when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly.” Herod certainly kept John under observation and put into practice - or “observed” - his teachings.”*

This is certainly how the word “**observed**” is used in the only other verse in which it occurs in Mark’s Gospel.

*“And he answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth”* Mark 6:20.

Similar usage is found in the only other two verses in the Gospel where an equivalent word, i.e. “*observe*,” appears.

***“All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not”*** Matthew 23:3.

***“Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen”*** Matthew 28:20.

If it be objected that the above verses refer to the observing of commandments or teachings, rather than the observing of a man directly, Ephesians 4:20 is explicit in this respect.

***“But ye have not so learned Christ.”***

Herod ***“observed”*** John, for a time, in the way that the Ephesian believers were supposed to have ***“learned”*** Christ.

It should be noted in passing that White has overlooked a second deficiency with respect to the modern readings for Mark 6:20. Where the AV1611 reads, ***“he did many things,”*** the NIV has ***“he was greatly puzzled”*** and the NASV reads ***“he was very perplexed.”*** The TBS<sup>8 p 163-4</sup> has shown in detail that the AV1611 reading is correct and why the modern alternatives are wrong, thereby obliterating the sense of the verse.

If White<sup>3 p 13</sup> is so concerned for ***“truth and honesty,”*** why does he not discuss this aspect of Mark 6:20?

Once again, Proverbs 11:1a should be noted, ***“A false balance is abomination to the LORD.”***

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 176-7, 164</sup> has a detailed explanation of why White’s assessment of ***“The Greek term”*** is incorrect, why the King James translators rightly translated it as ***“observed”*** and that they were aware of the term’s other meanings – see comments above on the AV1611’s marginal readings for Mark 6:20.

Dr Holland states, ***“When the Coast Guard speaks of “observing our shores,” they mean they are protecting them. So it is with Forest Rangers who set up “observation posts” for the purpose of protecting the wilderness. Both “observe” and “preserve” mean to keep something. This is why this very same Greek word is used in Luke 2:19 and is translated as “kept,” “Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart.”***

***“The basic Greek word is “suntereo.” According to the 1978 revision of The Analytical Greek Lexicon it is defined as, “to observe strictly, or to secure from harm, protect.” (Harold K. Moulton, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 392.) James H. Moulton and George Milligan note that one of the uses of this word in ancient non-literary writings is when, “a veteran claims that in view of his long military service, exemption from public burdens ought to be ‘strictly observed’ in his case.” (The Vocabulary Of The Greek Testament Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949, p. 614). These definitions stand in direct contrast with White’s statement that, “the Greek term simply does not mean ‘observe,’ but instead means ‘to protect.’” Clearly, it means both. The problem is not with the King James Bible, but with those who do not fully understand either Greek or their own language.”***

Compare Dr Holland’s analysis with Dr Ruckman’s remarks above and also Dr Mrs Ripplinger’s<sup>114</sup> warning about the use of lexicons, including Moulton and Milligan’s. See remarks in ***Chapter 5***. On balance, it appears that Dr Holland has exercised all necessary caution with respect to his sources and given a comprehensive overview, whilst the King’s men clearly chose the correct meaning for each of the contexts, as they did in the Old Testament, e.g. ***“his father observed the saying”*** Genesis 37:11b.

White<sup>3 p 238</sup> has an additional objection to Mark 6:20 to which Dr Holland<sup>164</sup> responds as follows.

*“White also makes an additional statement concerning this text and the translation produced by the Authorized Version in a footnote to his book.*

*““We note in passing how inferior even this rendering by the KJV is. ‘He was a just man and an holy’ makes little sense; what is ‘an holy’? Instead, the Greek phrase is quite easily translated as the NASB, ‘he was a righteous and holy man,’ both terms ‘righteous’ and ‘holy’ plainly describing John.” (THE KING JAMES ONLY CONTROVERSY, p. 238).*

*“This is a very strange statement, coming from a professor of New Testament Greek. The student of Greek knows that often a Greek adjective can be used for a Greek noun. For example, the Greek word for good is “agathos.” The Greek phrase “o agathos” can mean “the good” or it can mean “the good man.” The noun is understood in the adjective. This being the case, it is hard to understand how Mr. White cannot apply the same to his understanding of English. The phrase, “an holy” obviously means “a holy man” as the context reveals.*

*“Thomas Hubeart, one of the students in our class, has justly made the following observation as it relates to the above interpretation by James White. He writes,*

*““One cannot help but call Mr. White’s attention to the fact that the New American Standard’s rendering of the phrase means the same things as the KJV’s rendering! ‘A just man and an holy’ plainly means a just and holy man, since ‘man’ is obviously implied by the construction of the English phrase.”*

*“Brother Hubeart then does a wonderful job of illustrating this by citing Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s, The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes.*

*““But you have told us nothing!” cried the doctor. “Oh, there can be no doubt as to the sequence of events,” said Holmes. “There were three of them in it: the young man, the old man, and a third, to whose identity I have no clue...” - The Resident Patient. (See Thomas Hubeart’s Web Site; <http://members.aol.com/basfawlty>)”*

White could have seen the same construction in Matthew 19:48, with respect to the expressions **“the good”** and **“the bad”** and in Matthew 9:13, Mark 2:17 and Luke 5:32 with respect to the term **“the righteous,”** all of which are adjectives serving as nouns in their respective contexts.

Will Kinney<sup>165</sup> has these comments of White’s objection to the term **“observed”** in Mark 6:20.

#### **“OBSERVED**

*“Mark 6:20 King James Bible - “For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and a holy, and OBSERVED HIM; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly.”*

*“James White criticizes the rendering of this verse in the KJB in his book The King James Only Controversy. In chapter 9 titled Problems in the KJV on page 224 Mr. White begins a whole series of objections to various King James readings.*

*“He starts off by saying: “Well Nobody is Perfect. The men who worked on the translation of the AV nearly four hundred years ago were great scholars. No one can possibly dispute that fact.”*

*“Well, James, if this is so, then why do you spend 19 pages in this chapter trying to show how they completely dropped the ball and committed many unparadonable errors in their*

translation? And if they were “great scholars” as you say, and you place yourself in an assumed position to correct their many errors, then what does that make You? The Greatest scholar?

“James continues: “BUT all great scholars know their limitations. They recognize their fallibility. And I really doubt they would take the slightest offense to a reasoned critique of their work. The first problem we will examine is to be found in Mark’s gospel, chapter 6, verse 20:

“KJV “For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and OBSERVED him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly.”

“NASB (NKJV, NIV, ESV) “for Herod was afraid of John, knowing that he was a righteous and holy man, and KEPT HIM SAFE. And when he heard him, he was very perplexed; but he used to enjoy listening to him.”

“Mr. White continues: “Did Herod “observe” John, as the KJV says, or “keep him safe,” as the NASB says? The Greek term simply does not mean “observe” but instead means “to protect.” One might possibly suggest that “observe” once meant “to protect”, but such seems a long stretch, especially since the KJV renders the same word “preserve” at Matthew 9:17 and Luke 5:38.”

“Now, to address Mr. White’s scholarly criticism.

“The verb used here is *sunteereo* and is found only four times in the New Testament. Twice it is used in the sense of “putting new wine into new bottles and both are PRESERVED.” Once it is used in Luke 2:19 where we are told: “But Mary KEPT all these things, and pondered them in her heart.” The fourth instance is here in Mark where the KJB says Herod OBSERVED him.

“Even the NASB give three different renderings to this single verb - “kept safe”, “preserved” and “treasured”.

“All words in both Hebrew and Greek often have multiple meanings depending on the context in which they are used. According to various lexicons and other translations, the KJB reading of “observed him” is totally accurate.

“Liddell and Scott’s *Greek-English Lexicon*, the seventeenth edition 1887 on page 680 lists the verb *sunteereo* and gives the following meanings. Number one on their list is “to watch closely”; then they list “to preserve, keep safe; and “to keep in mind”. It also can mean “to watch one’s opportunity”.

“Likewise *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, on page 800 lists among the various meanings of this verb: “to keep in mind, to be concerned about”, and “to hold or treasure up in one’s memory”.

“Joseph Henry Thayer’s *Lexicon* the 19th printing 1978 also lists on page 606 one of the meanings of this verb as: “to keep a thing in mind (lest it be forgotten)”.

“Kittel’s massive work, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Volume VIII page 143 also describes the verb *teereo* and its cognates as having the meaning of “to take note of”, and “to observe”.

“Moulton, *The Analytical Greek Lexicon Revised*, 1978, page 392, has “to observe strictly” as a translation.

“The verb *sunteereo* can have the meaning of to keep something together in the mind, and thus mean “to observe” something or someone. There are many similar verbs found in

the New Testament that all versions translate with the idea of holding something in the mind.

“See for example Luke 14:1 “they watched him” (*parateereo*); 1 Corinthians 15:2 “if ye keep in memory” (*kateko*), and John 1:5, and Ephesians 3:18 “to comprehend” (*katalambano*).

“Not only does the King James Bible say that Herod OBSERVED HIM, but...many others give a similar meaning. Both Tyndale and the Geneva Bible say: “Herod gave him reverence”. Darby gives the marginal reading of “observed him”. The Italian Diodati version says Herod “*l’osservava*” - observed him. The French Ostervald 1996 “*un homme juste et saint; il le considérait*” - he was a just man and holy and he considered him, French Martin 1744 - “*et il avait du respect pour lui*” and he had respect for him; and the Spanish Reina Valera 1858 and 1909 say “*le tenía respeto*” - he had respect unto him.

“James Murdock’s 1858 translation of the Syriac Peshitta reads: “For Herod was afraid of John, because he knew him to be a just and holy man: and HE OBSERVED HIM, and gave ear to him in many things and did the things, and he heard him with satisfaction”...

“So we can see from this little study that when James White says emphatically, “The Greek term simply does not mean “observe” but instead means “to protect”, he is merely giving us his own personal opinion, not hard facts. Others of equal or superior learning disagree with Mr. White’s conclusions.”

Note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks in **Chapter 5** about the doubtful reliability of many lexicons and theological dictionaries. When these potentially hostile witnesses agree with the AV1611, they totally undermine White’s objections.

White’s next attack is on Mark 9:18, where he claims that the reading “**pineth away**” as found in the AV1611 “is obviously less than adequate in comparison with “stiffens out” (NASV) or “becomes rigid” (NIV).”

Why is the AV1611 reading “obviously less than adequate” than the modern readings? White fails to give any reason. However, this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 32-3, 164</sup> has addressed this verse, because ‘our critic’ attacked it as White did. References have been updated. See **Appendix, Table A1**, for the general agreement of the NIV and NASV with the JB, NWT.

“Our critic’s next “error” is in **Mark 9:18**, where the AV1611 readings “**teareth him**” and “**and pineth away**” are replaced by “throws him to the ground” and “becomes rigid”, or similar, in the NIV, JB, NWT (“loses his strength” instead of “pineth away”)...

“Two books which deal extensively with demon possession are *War on the Saints* by Jesse Penn-Lewis and *He Came to Set the Captives Free* by Rebecca Brown, M.D. Dr. Brown, p 247, states: “Demons tear apart a physical body on the molecular level. They do this in such a way that devastating damage can be done to the various organs without altering the appearance of the cellular structure under our microscopes.”

“It would appear that the AV1611’s “error” here has yielded medical information IN ADVANCE of subsequent scientific research.

“Mrs. Penn-Lewis confirms the other AV1611 reading in this verse. She writes of individuals under demonic influence, p 151: “Such persons lose their flesh, for demoniac possession is very wearing on the vital forces and produces a terrible strain on the heart and nervous system.”

*“Note that whereas the AV1611 uses the simple word “tare” in verse 20, the NIV uses the more complex expression “threw into a convulsion”. See Gail Riplinger’s detailed analysis of the complexities of the NIV’s wording<sup>14 p 209</sup>.”*

The bibles of Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all have **“pineth away”** in agreement with the AV1611 so White’s criticism of the AV1611 applies equally to the bibles that God used to bring in and progress the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation. Wycliffe’s Bible<sup>46</sup> has *“waxes dry,”* an indication of deterioration in agreement with the AV1611’s **“pineth away”** because Sarah is said to have **“waxed old”** in Genesis 18:12 and David to have **“waxed faint”** in 2 Samuel 21:15.

So White’s criticism applies to **“the morning star”** of the Reformation as well, Revelation 2:28. But it is invalid.

White’s next objection is to the word **“possess”** in Luke 18:12, because he prefers *“get”* or similar, as found in the NASV and the NIV, JB, NWT. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

White states that, his emphases, *“Another less-than-sterling translation is found at Luke 18:12...Did the Pharisee tith on his possessions or his increase? The term means to “procure for oneself, acquire, get.””*

The bibles of the English Protestant Reformation, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all have **“possess”** in agreement with the AV1611 or similar, Wycliffe reading *“have in possession.”* The AV1611, therefore, continues to preserve the God-honoured Traditional Text recognized by true bible believers from earliest times.

As usual, it is White’s opinion that is *“less-than-sterling.”* The term **“possess”** covers all possibilities, including getting or acquiring but with the added emphasis on holding onto or owning what is acquired.

This sense is found repeatedly in the Old Testament, where most of the 106 occurrences of the term **“possess”** in the scriptures are found. For example:

***“That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies”*** Genesis 22:17.

***“And Caleb stilled the people before Moses, and said, Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it”*** Numbers 13:30.

Concerning the Pharisees, White should have compared **“spiritual things with spiritual”** 1 Corinthians 2:13b. Each Pharisee tithed not only what he acquired but also what he owned, e.g. the produce of his **“garden of herbs”** 1 Kings 21:2.

***“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone”*** Matthew 23:23.

***“But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone”*** Luke 11:42.

Again, the AV1611 is right and the modern versions, along with James White, are wrong.

White’s next objections are to Acts 5:30 and Hebrews 10:23. See end of **Chapter 5** for Dr Ruckman’s and Dr Holland’s answers to White’s criticisms of the Holy Bible with respect to these verses.

It needs only to be noted here that for Acts 5:30, Wycliffe's Bible<sup>46</sup> has "*hanging in a tree*," Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops'<sup>138</sup> all have "*slew and hanged*" in agreement with the AV1611. All these pre-1611 bibles have either "*confession of our hope*," Wycliffe or "*profession of our hope*," Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops' ("*the hope*") for Hebrews 10:23. These readings are clearly deficiencies in the pre-1611 bibles that the Lord saw fit to correct, or at least refine, in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, certainly according to the testimony of history.

White now says<sup>3 p 226</sup> that the expression "*we offend all*" in James 3:2 is "*misleading*" and that "*James is trying to communicate*" that "*we all stumble in many ways*" NASV, NKJV, along with the NIV, JB, NWT. See *Appendix, Table A1*.

Wycliffe has "*all we offend*," Tyndale, Geneva and Bishops' have "*we sin all*." The sense of the pre-1611 bibles is that 'we all sin,' similar to the modern versions, whereas the sense of the AV1611 is that "*we offend*" or incite resentment, hatred or anger in others. This is the modern usage of the word and it is used this way in both Testaments, for example.

***"And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish, saying, I have offended; return from me: that which thou puttest on me will I bear. And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah king of Judah three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold"*** 2 Kings 18:14.

***"The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity"*** Matthew 13:41. Note that the Lord draws a distinction between "***things that offend***" and individual sinners, or "***them which do iniquity***."

***"Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying?"*** Matthew 15:12.

***"Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee"*** Matthew 17:27.

The word "***offend***" has the modern connotation in all of these examples, with respect to the giving or taking of offence, not sinning or 'stumbling' as such.

With respect to White's question, "*Do Christians offend all people?*" for which he indicates that the answer is no, White forgot the second part of James 3:2.

***"If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body"*** James 3:2.

David prayed for this level of perfection, Paul sought it for himself and his followers.

***"Set a watch, O LORD, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips"*** Psalm 141:3.

***"Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God"*** 1 Corinthians 10:32.

James is likewise setting forth the standard for the believer, by which he may "***give none offence***" that is, "***a perfect man***," or as Paul states, "***unblameable in holiness before God***" 1 Thessalonians 3:13. James confesses that he has not attained this standard, and so does Paul, Philippians 3:12 but "***perfecting holiness in the fear of God***" 2 Corinthians 7:1b remains the standard for the believer, nevertheless.



Note that the issue here is one of giving offence. That is why Paul exhorts, ***“If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men”*** Romans 12:18 because others may still take offence, even as they did with the Lord Jesus Christ, Who is ***“a perfect man,”*** Whose speech was ***“always with grace, seasoned with salt”*** Colossians 4:6.

***“Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying?”*** Matthew 15:12.

White also overlooked James’s reference to ***“many things”*** with respect to his declaration that ***“we offend all.”*** As Dr Ruckman<sup>144 p 70</sup> shows, James is saying that the more parties one attempts to satisfy, the more parties there are who are likely to be offended, including the Lord Himself. The lukewarmness of the Laodicean Church is a good example, Revelation 3:14-20, as is the dissimulation of Peter and Barnabus Galatians 2:11-15 and the temporary lapse of the Apostle Paul himself, Acts 21. He lost two years from his ministry as a result, Acts 24:27.

In sum, appeasement doesn’t work. Paul’s admonition of Galatians 1:10, taken with 1 Corinthians 10:32, 33, is both biblical and practical.

***“For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.”***

Again, it is the AV1611, not the modern versions, that conveys what ***“James is trying to communicate.”***

White now claims that 1 Corinthians 4:4 in the AV1611 is ambiguous and ***“unclear to say the least”*** because the reading ***“I know nothing by myself”*** ***“makes no sense in the context.”*** According to White, ***“Paul is talking about judging himself and his ministry”*** and the NASV reading ***“I am conscious of nothing against myself”*** is therefore correct, along with the NIV’s ***“My conscience is clear,”*** both of which readings agree with the DR, JR, JB, NWT. See ***Appendix, Table A1.***

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has ***“For I am nothing over trowing [thinking, believing] to myself,”*** Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all agree with the AV1611, Tyndale having ***“nought by myself,”*** the others having ***“nothing by myself.”*** Wycliffe’s reading, though unfamiliar, appears closer to that of the AV1611 than it does to those of the NIV, NASV.

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 191-2</sup> addressed 1 Corinthians 4:4 in answer to ‘our critic’ who had raised objections to the AV1611 reading similar to those of James White. A summary extract is included.

***“Our critic’s last “wrong use” [of a preposition] is in 1 Corinthians 4:4 where “I know nothing by myself”, AV1611, should be “my conscience is clear” or similar according to the NIV, JB, NWT...***

***“That the AV1611 reading is correct and needs no modification is revealed in Psalm 19:12, 13 “Who can discern his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins...” Like David, Paul did not have sufficient wisdom to know himself perfectly. He therefore looked to the Lord “that judgeth me”, verse 4, to “bring to light the HIDDEN things of darkness”, such as “secret faults” so that he could confess and forsake them, Proverbs 28:13, 1 John 1:9.***

***“The NIV etc. reading [“My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent”] is misleading because conscience DOES indicate guilt or innocence, unless it is weak, defiled or seared. See Romans 2:15, 1 Corinthians 8:7, 1 Timothy 4:2. Moreover, a con-***

science “**void of offence**” was Paul’s lifelong objective, which cost him effort, Acts 24:16 - AS EVEN THE NIV ADMITS!

“I must admit to some difficulty with the NIV’s rendering of “the Greek” in 1 Corinthians 4:4. “Conscience” in the form of the noun “suneidesis” is not present in either Ne or the TR, although our critic could probably justify translation of the verb “know”, “sunoida” in this fashion. However, “clear”, which is “agnos” in 2 Corinthians 7:11, is entirely absent from 1 Corinthians 4:4 in both Ne and the TR.”

White has bypassed the serious implications of the NIV’s free translation of 1 Corinthians 4:4 but he is wrong to say that the AV1611 is “unclear” in this verse and that the AV1611 reading “makes no sense in the context.” It makes perfect sense in the context, as the rest of the verse reveals.

**“But he that judgeth me is the Lord”** 1 Corinthians 4:4b.

Will Kinney<sup>166</sup> has these instructive comments on the verse.

“1 Corinthians 4:4 “For I know nothing BY myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord.”

“This verse is fiercely attacked by many “noted scholars” as being a blunder and a defect in our beloved King James Bible. Most modern versions, like the NKJV, NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV, have altered the translation to mean something else. Here is a site that lists several “defects” in the King James Bible. [www.bible-researcher.com/kjvdefects.html](http://www.bible-researcher.com/kjvdefects.html)

“Notice how these learned men exalt themselves and heap praise on one another [note White’s<sup>3 p 121</sup> reference to “fine ongoing work” by other bible critics like himself], all the while “correcting” the Book of books with degrading insults. They suggest that “volumes, instead of a few pages, may easily be written to illustrate the defects of the A.V.”, while they refer to themselves as “this honored body”. I have read through the entire list and every one of their criticisms can be refuted by showing parallel examples, other versions and commentators who agree with the KJB readings, or instances of where the modern versions have done the exact same thing they criticize in the KJB.

“Here is what this “honored body” of scholars has to say regarding 1 Corinthians 4:4.

““Volumes, instead of a few pages, might easily be written to illustrate the existing defects of the Authorized Version. From a few of the many existing compilations on this subject, some specimens will be drawn. Members of the Revision Committees have a special right to be heard on these points, and Professor Hare of this honored body gives the following illustrations:

““St. Paul says, in the Authorized Version (1 Cor. iv., 4), ‘I know nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby justified.’ This seems incongruous, because ‘to know nothing by one’s self’ means ‘to know nothing originally or independently.’ In the older English, ‘to know nothing by one’s self’ meant ‘to know nothing lying at one’s door,’ and this is the only sense of which the Greek words in the passage which seems so incongruous are susceptible.”

“Notice the reasons given for correcting the KJB, and how sure they are of themselves. First, they say the reading of “I know nothing BY myself” SEEMS incongruous, and they then conclude “this is THE ONLY SENSE of which the Greek words...are susceptible”.

“Secondly, they redefine the simple term “I know nothing by myself” with some very dubious and obscure definition, and tell us the simple sense cannot possibly be right because it doesn’t make sense to know nothing independently.

*“Well, it may come as a shock to some, but there are a whole lot of things about God and how things are being worked out in His plan that we do not know independently. Only God knows them and the context of First Corinthians clearly shows this.*

*“The apostle says: “Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful. But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man’s judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God.”*

*“Most modern versions actually create a contradiction while supposedly correcting the “defects” of the King James Bible. The NKJV (NASB, RSV, ESV, Green’s interlinear, etc.) say: “For I know nothing AGAINST MYSELF, yet I am not justified by this.”*

*“Which of us can truthfully say “I know nothing against myself”? All of us recognize that we have failed miserably in the past and still continue to fall way short of the character and image of Christ. Paul himself certainly knew of many things “against” himself. He says of himself in 1 Timothy 1:13-15 “who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief...Christ came into the world to save sinners: OF WHOM I AM CHIEF.” Notice he does not say I WAS chief, but I AM chief.”*

*“The whole of Romans chapter 7 deals with many things Paul and all real Christians know against themselves. “For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin, for that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not: but what I hate, that I do...For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not...the evil which I would not, that I do...O wretched man that I am.”*

*“Can any of us honestly say that we know nothing AGAINST ourselves? Apparently the apostle Paul could not; unless of course you use a modern version.*

*“The context of 1 Corinthians 4 is speaking about stewards. The Lord Jesus Christ gave many parables about stewards who were entrusted with certain duties. It was not until they finally reported to their Lord that they heard from his mouth either a rebuke or a praise regarding how they had done.*

*“The apostle tells the Corinthians that it was a small thing of no importance how they judged him or any man. Paul obviously was also a man. Yea, he says, I judge not mine own self. According to the modern versions, Paul had already judged himself. The modern versions have him concluding that he knew of nothing against himself, and this creates two contradictions. One - he certainly knew of things against himself as he testifies in other places of the New Testament. And Two - How can he say he does not judge himself, and then say he didn’t know of anything against him and that his conscience was clear? This would imply that he already was judging his faithfulness as a steward.*

*“Rather, the King James reading of “I know nothing BY myself” is the only one that correctly fits the context. Paul concludes in the next verse: “Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.”*

*“We do not know by ourselves how well we are doing in our Christian walk. We may think we are doing better than we really are, or we may criticize ourselves more harshly*

than we deserve. God alone knows how we are doing and it is only when He appears that each of us will learn the truth of how faithful we have been with what He has given us.

*“My understanding of the passage is that he is saying we cannot really know how well or poorly we are doing in our stewardship. We may think we are doing well, when we are not, and vice versa. I don’t know whether I am doing everything right, but my ignorance does not make me right before God (justified). God won’t say, in effect, Oh you didn’t know you were teaching false doctrine, so it is OK. Or You didn’t know that was not what I wanted you to do, so it is OK too. If I do or teach something out of ignorance, I still will be held accountable before God, and He will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and the counsels of the heart.*

*“Not only does the King James Bible read: “For I know nothing BY myself...but he that judgeth me is the Lord.” but so also do Tyndale 1525, Miles Coverdale 1535, Bishop’s Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, John Wesley’s translation 1755, the 21st Century KJV, and the Third Millennium Bible. The King James Bible is right, as always, and the modern versions that try to “correct” it have actually ruined the true sense of the passage.”*

White continues his criticisms of the Holy Bible with an attack on Hebrews 9:7, where he states that, *“Sometimes an entire concept will disappear from the text due to a less-than-clear KJV translation,”* which, according to White is **“errors of the people”** and should be changed to *“sins of the people committed in ignorance,”* as in the NIV, NASV, DR, JR, NWT. The JB’s *“faults”* is closer to the AV1611 reading than to those of the other versions. See **Appendix, Table A1**. White claims that, *“the Greek is very expressive.”*

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> all have *“his ignorance and the people’s,”* or similar, indicating another refinement that the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible introduced, because the alternatives to the AV1611 are too limited in scope. Hebrews 9:7 refers to atonement for all sin, not only **“sin through ignorance”** Leviticus 4:2, 13, 22, 27 but also sin through wilful trespass, Leviticus 6:1-8.

The basis for Hebrews 9:7 is found in Leviticus 16. See especially the following passages. They show unequivocally that the AV1611 is the correct reading, however *“expressive”* the Greek may be.

***“For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the LORD”*** Leviticus 16:30.

***“And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year. And he did as the LORD commanded Moses”*** Leviticus 16:34.

White now moves to attack Isaiah 65:11, where he insists that, ***“that troop...unto that number”*** should be *“Gad...Meni”* NKJV or *“Fortune...Destiny”* NASV. The NIV agrees with the DR, NWT, although the DR omits *“Destiny.”* The NKJV agrees with the JB. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has *“fortune”* and like the DR, omits *“destiny,”* both versions apparently influenced by the Latin Vulgate at this point. The Bishops’ Bible has<sup>138</sup> *“Jupiter”* and *“the planets”* but the Geneva Bible<sup>49</sup> has *“the multitude”* and *“the number,”* essentially in agreement with the AV1611.

It is interesting that Coverdale’s Bible<sup>167</sup>, published in 1535, has *“fortune,”* like Wycliffe’s and *“treasure”* in Isaiah 65:11, because White claims that, *“Our knowledge of*

*the ancient world...has expanded greatly since the time of the KJV translators. This has influenced modern translations."*

Wycliffe's and Coverdale's bibles show that their translators had sufficient knowledge of "the ancient world" to produce readings that at least partly correspond to the 'modern' NASV but White contradicts himself in his next paragraph when he states that "the 1611 marginal readings...indicated that the original Hebrew terms translated "number" and "troop" were "Gad" and "Meni."

It is therefore clear that, contrary to White's assertion about present-day knowledge, the King James translators had sufficient "knowledge of the ancient world" to note the transliterated readings that White approves of in the text of the NKJV. (White has inadvertently reversed the order of the translated terms. See the AV1611 margin for Isaiah 65:11 and comments below.)

White continues, "'Gad" and "Meni"...were Babylonian or Syrian gods, specifically, the god of fortune (Gad) and the god of "destiny" (Meni). Isaiah is upbraiding the people for engaging in idolatrous worship of Gad and Meni...That's a fairly long way from "that troop" and "that number"!"

As usual, it is James White who is "a fairly long way from" from "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21.

White's reference to "Syrian gods" cannot be correct. King Ahaz had treacherously worshipped "the gods of Damascus" 2 Chronicles 28:35 but as Ahaz had himself been warned by Isaiah, Syria would soon fall to the emerging power of Assyria.

***"For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria"*** Isaiah 8:4.

Therefore, by the time of Isaiah's prophecy in Chapter 65, Syria had been conquered by Assyria and "Syrian gods" were a thing of the past. White's reference to "Babylonian...gods" is likewise misleading in the context because the only "Babylonian...gods" that Isaiah mentions elsewhere are Bel and Nebo\*, not "'Gad" and "Meni."

***"Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle: your carriages were heavy loaden; they are a burden to the weary beast"*** Isaiah 46:1.

\*Bel's association with Babylon is clear from Jeremiah 50:22, 51:44 and Alexander Hislop<sup>168, p 26, 34</sup> likewise associates Nebo with Babylon, indicating via Kitto's *Illustrated Commentary* with respect to Isaiah 46:1 that Nebo "'may thus...be no more than another name for Bel himself, or as a characteristic epithet applied to him; it being not unusual to repeat the same thing, in the same verse, in equivalent terms."

Contrary to White's notion that "Gad and Meni" are "a fairly long way from "that troop" and "that number"!" the King's men appear simply but shrewdly to have translated these terms as they are found in the scriptures.

***"And Leah said, A troop cometh: and she called his name Gad"*** Genesis 30:11.

***"This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it"*** Daniel 5:26.

Hislop affirms<sup>168 p 94-5</sup> that "The name Meni is just the Chaldee form of the Hebrew "Mene," the "numberer"...this shows the peculiar emphasis of the first words in the Di-

*vine sentence that sealed the doom of Belshazzar, as representing the primeval god – “MENE, MENE, Tekel, Upharsin,” which is as much as covertly to say, “The numberer is numbered.””*

But Hislop reveals that the names “*Gad*” and “*Meni*” are primarily associated with ancient Babylon and its kings, Nimrod and Cush, Genesis 10:8-10, not explicitly with the Babylon of Isaiah’s time and later.

*“The name Gad evidently refers, in the first instance, to the war-god, for it signifies to assault; but it also signifies “the assembler;” [i.e. of troops] and under both ideas it is applicable to Nimrod, whose general character was that of the sun-god, for he was the first grand warrior...The name Meni, “the numberer,” on the other hand, seems just a synonym for the name of Cush.”*

Hislop maintains that the AV1611 readings “*that troop*” and “*that number*” are incorrect and should be given as “*Gad*” and “*Meni*,” as in the NKJV, supporting White’s notion that “*Isaiah is upbraiding the people for engaging in idolatrous worship of Gad and Meni*” but, as indicated, this view is not supported by scripture.

The nation of Israel was steeped in idolatry during the reign of King Ahaz of Judah, which coincided with the ministry of the prophet Isaiah, Isaiah 1:1, 7:1. The spiritual state of both Israel and Judah was considerably worse than White’s comment indicates in that the idolatrous worship of these two nations was not limited to the ancient Babylonian gods derived from Nimrod and Cush. 2 Kings 17 describes the nation’s apostasy, as it was “*In the twelfth year of Ahaz king of Judah*” verse 1.

*“And they left all the commandments of the LORD their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made a grove, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal”* 2 Kings 17:16. (Hislop<sup>168 p 26</sup> identifies “*Baal*” and “*Bel*,” Isaiah 46:1 as distinct titles applied to the same god.)

*“Also Judah kept not the commandments of the LORD their God, but walked in the statutes of Israel which they made”* 2 Kings 17:19.

2 Kings 17:29-31 lists several gods that were imported into Israel by means of enforced immigration, verse 24, and which may have made Israel and Judah’s existing idolatrous state worse but Gad and Meni are not among them, casting further doubt on White’s assertion above.

In spite of revival under King Hezekiah, 2 Kings 18, 19 the people of Judah lapsed into an even worse idolatrous state during the reign of Hezekiah’s son Manasseh.

*“But they hearkened not: and Manasseh seduced them to do more evil than did the nations whom the LORD destroyed before the children of Israel”* 2 Kings 21:9.

The parlous spiritual state to which Judah eventually descended was described by Isaiah’s contemporary prophet Hosea, Hosea 1:1, first with respect to Israel and then by extension to Judah. The prophet Jeremiah later described Judah’s apostasy that was without doubt well advanced by the end of Isaiah’s ministry.

Note the greed of the apostate spiritual and national leaders of the time, in addition to their idolatry.

*“Their drink is sour: they have committed whoredom continually: her rulers with shame do love, Give ye”* Hosea 4:18.

***“And as troops of robbers wait for a man, so the company of priests murder in the way by consent: for they commit lewdness”*** Hosea 6:9.

***“When I would have healed Israel, then the iniquity of Ephraim was discovered, and the wickedness of Samaria: for they commit falsehood; and the thief cometh in, and the troop of robbers spoileth without”*** Hosea 7:1.

***“The LORD hath also a controversy with Judah, and will punish Jacob according to his ways; according to his doings will he recompense him”*** Hosea 12:2.

***“The priests said not, Where is the LORD? and they that handle the law knew me not: the pastors also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal, and walked after things that do not profit”*** Jeremiah 2:8.

***“But where are thy gods that thou hast made thee? let them arise, if they can save thee in the time of thy trouble: for according to the number of thy cities are thy gods, O Judah”*** Jeremiah 2:28.

Isaiah’s admonition in Isaiah 65:11 thus becomes clear.

Isaiah is rebuking the men of Judah for feeding and supporting avaricious rulers, e.g. Manasseh and idolatrous clergy who are “*as troops of robbers*” and for worshipping not merely two ancient Babylonian deities but a multitude of idols, as many as “*according to the number of thy cities, O Judah.*”

By implication, Isaiah is also rebuking the men of Judah for not crying, “*Where is the LORD?*” that is, disdainful of or indifferent to the Lord and “*settled on their lees.*”

***“And it shall come to pass at that time, that I will search Jerusalem with candles, and punish the men that are settled on their lees: that say in their heart, The LORD will not do good, neither will he do evil”*** Zephaniah 1:12.

Isaiah could similarly rebuke the nominally ‘Christian’ nations of today but the modern versions, along with James White, fail to disclose the extent of the national and spiritual calamity, both in Isaiah’s time and ours.

Once again, the King’s men were right and all their critics, including James White, are wrong.

White then raises objections to two further Old Testament verses, 1 Kings 10:28, where “*linen yard*” (twice) in the AV1611 should supposedly be “*Kue*” (twice) as in the NASV and in the NIV, DR, JB and 1 Chronicles 5:26 where the AV1611 distinguishes between the Assyrian kings, Pul and Tilgathpilneser but the NASV makes them the same individual, as do the NIV, NWT. The NWT has an independent reading in 1 Kings 10:28 and the DR, JB agree with the AV1611 in 1 Chronicles 5:26 in that they distinguish between the two kings. See *Appendix, Table A1*.

White declares, his emphasis, that ““*Kue*” is a place in Egypt from which Solomon purchased horses, not “*linen yarn*”...*Pul was Tilgath-pilneser.*”

The simple answer to White’s diatribe against the Holy Bible is that “*Kue*” is not “*a place in Egypt*” and “*Pul*” was not explicitly “*Tilgathpilneser.*”

In 1 Kings 10:28, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has “*Coa*” like the DR, Coverdale<sup>167</sup> has “*Reua*,” the Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> bibles have “*linen*” in agreement with the AV1611. The AV1611 reading is correct because “*linen*” does come from Egypt in the scriptures and Egyptian linen is mentioned repeatedly in the latter part of Exodus as one of the materials for the furnishings of the tabernacle.

*“And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck”* Genesis 41:42.

*“And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment”* Exodus 12:35.

*“And blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair”* Exodus 25:4.

*“Fine linen with broidered work from Egypt was that which thou spreadest forth to be thy sail; blue and purple from the isles of Elishah was that which covered thee”* Ezekiel 27:7.

Kue is not mentioned in the AV1611 but is found to be a region in Asia Minor<sup>169 p 67, 71, 75</sup>, located close to Paul's home city of Tarsus in Cilicia, Acts 21:39. The modern readings are therefore completely wrong. (The bible atlas states that the AV1611 reading in 1 Kings 10:28 is wrong but it does not mention any place in Egypt called Kue.)

James White<sup>3 p 217</sup> states, his emphasis, that *“the person who accepts the supernatural character of Scripture is in a position to see the **entirety** of the Bible and its message.”* White should have the courtesy to abide by his own rules. He has ignored *“the **entirety** of the Bible”* in this verse.

In 1 Chronicles 5:26, the bibles of Wycliffe, Coverdale, Geneva and Bishops' all have *“the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tilgathpilneser king of Assyria”* in agreement with the AV1611.

That the AV1611 reading is correct and the modern alternatives are wrong is explained as follows<sup>170</sup>, with respect to the AV1611 and NKJV readings for 1 Chronicles 5:26.

*“The NKJV makes Pul and Tiglathpileser one and the same person. This is NOT a translation, rather it is an INTERPRETATION based on a faulty archeological judgment. The word “Pul” is a TITLE meaning Lord, it is not a name – and could therefore refer to ANY Assyrian ruler.*

*“This misidentification is directly opposed to the actual translation and is absolutely shown to be false by the Biblical chronology of the Hebrew kings. Such an erroneous identification renders Biblical chronology as impossible, unless one ignores many other scriptures...Actually, the name of the principal Assyrian god from their older works is Vul...the letter “V” is identical to the letter “P” in their language such that Pul is the name of their god and some man or men took the name or title of their god unto themselves or their position.”*

Henry Halley<sup>116 p 208</sup> identifies an Assyrian king taking the title Pul and his most likely successor, Tiglathpileser, as having separate inscriptions. Although both inscriptions mention King Hoshea of Israel, 2 Kings 17, Halley clearly indicates that they are separate individuals, as does the scripture, which shows that they invaded Israel separately.

*“And Pul the king of Assyria came against the land: and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand”* 2 Kings 15:20.

*“And Menahem exacted the money of Israel, even of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man fifty shekels of silver, to give to the king of Assyria. So the king of Assyria turned back, and stayed not there in the land”* 2 Kings 15:21.



***“In the days of Pekah king of Israel came Tiglathpileser king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abelbethmaachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria”*** 2 Kings 15:29.

Nothing is said about Tiglathpileser (Tilgathpilneser) *returning* to the land of Israel in verse 29, although the context would require such clarification if Pul and Tiglathpileser were one and the same individual. Clearly they are different individuals and the modern translations are self-contradictory when 2 Kings 15 is matched with 1 Chronicles 5.

Note that although the NASV ‘updates’ the name Tiglathpileser from 2 Kings 15:29 to Tilgathpilneser in 1 Chronicles 5:26, in agreement with the AV1611, the NIV, NKJV retain Tiglathpileser in both verses, while the AV1611 is accused of retaining ‘archaic’ language.

Once again, however, White has ignored *“the entirety of the Bible”* with respect to his criticisms of the AV1611.

White<sup>3 p 228-234</sup> now accuses the AV1611 of contradictions that exist *“only in the KJV, not in modern versions such as the NASB or NIV.”* His first example is Acts 9:7 versus Acts 22:9, where the AV1611 has ***“hearing a voice”*** and ***“heard not the voice of him that spake to me”*** respectively. White highlights only ***“heard not the voice”*** in Acts 22:9, in order to give undue emphasis to the ‘contradiction’ and indicates that *“did not understand the voice”* NIV, NASV, is the correct reading.

Unusually, the NIV, NASV depart from the DR, JR, JB, NWT in this verse, which all agree with the AV1611. However, they all agree together against the AV1611 in omitting ***“and were afraid”*** from Acts 22:9, a fact that White fails to mention. See *Appendix, Table A1*. Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles<sup>62</sup> support this omission. Alford deems the phrase doubtful but the opposition to the phrase is sufficient for Nestle and the RV to omit it as well. Again, White, the NASV and NIV are in most unsavoury company.

However, it is interesting that even Ricker Berry’s Interlinear and Nestle essentially agree with the AV1611 reading ***“heard not the voice of him that spake to me,”*** which further weakens White’s case against it.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits the phrase but the bibles of Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all contain it, a strong testimony to this phrase as part of the Traditional Text, preserved by bible believers down through the centuries. All of these pre-1611 bibles agree with the AV1611 reading ***“heard not the voice of him that spake to me.”*** It is clearly a God-honoured reading, White’s opinion to the contrary notwithstanding.

White also neglects to mention that the NKJV reads with the AV1611 as well in Acts 22:9. He appears inclined only to cite this translation when it conflicts with the AV1611, as in Isaiah 65:11.

The many witnesses to the AV1611 reading in Acts 22:9 that White disputes affirm that it is correct. How then is the apparent ‘contradiction’ between Acts 9:7, 22:9 resolved? Dr Ruckman<sup>171 p 335</sup> provides the explanation.

*“This ancient “chestnut” is still quoted at fundamental schools to make the student think that “Greek grammar” will solve the “problem.” The problem is solved quite sufficiently by reading John 12:29. You can hear A VOICE without hearing THE VOICE of the one speaking, or understanding what the voice says.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>88 p 298</sup> adds that, his emphases *“While Saul hears the exact words and identifies the speaker (vs 4), those with him (Acts 22:9) hear only a noise (Acts 9:7) without*

*being able to locate a **speaker** or understand the **words**. The same thing happened exactly like this in John 12:28, 29.”*

Note that Dr Ruckman’s comments are precise with respect to “*understanding what the voice says.*” The modern attempt to convey this meaning, “*understand the voice,*” is imprecise and therefore inferior to the AV1611 reading because it is *words*, or *speech*, Genesis 11:7, John 8:43 that are or are not understood, not a *voice* as such.

In short, Paul’s companions heard “*a voice*,” like thunder, John 12:29 but they did not hear “*the voice of him that spake to me*” in that only Paul received the words recorded in Acts 9:4-6, as indicated by the context because these words were addressed specifically to him. It is the NIV, NASV that confuse the account in Acts 9 because they omit most of the Lord’s words to Paul in this passage. See remarks in **Chapter 4**.

Will Kinney<sup>172</sup> has further enlightened comment on Acts 9:7, 22:9, with explicit reference to White’s ‘contradiction.’

*“Acts 9:7 with Acts 22:9*

*“Heard the voice or didn’t hear the voice?”*

*“Amazingly, some Christians bring up these two Scriptures and think there is an error. At a Bible club I belong to, one member says:*

*““For those of you who think there are no errors or contradictions in the KJV please explain this one. This is a small matter but makes the point.*

*““KJV Acts 9:7 And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.*

*““KJV Acts 22:9 And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me.*

*““This most certainly appears to me to be a contradiction, did they “hear a voice” or did they “hear not a voice”?”*

*“Then another Christian answers with this: “Your example is well known as a contradiction in the Scriptures, not only in the KJV, but in other translations as well. The question is whether or not Luke wrote down two different accounts of this same story. Luke is giving testimony to Saul’s conversion in both accounts, one time as initial telling of this conversion from what Luke knows of it, and the next as an account or transcript of Paul’s testimony before the Jews. Only two conclusions can be drawn. Either Luke made an error and the original Scriptures are incorrect, or there has been a mistake by some scribe in the copying of Luke’s book of Acts. I tend to say the latter.”*

*“In a similar manner, James White, in his book *The KJV Only Controversy*, brings up this same example on page 229. Mr White overstates his case by saying: “This alleged contradiction exists **ONLY IN THE KJV**, not in modern translations such as the NASB or NIV...Such ambiguity is, unfortunately, a common problem in the KJV.”*

*“Remember, James White recommends the NKJV in his book as being one of three “reliable versions”.*

*“Comments like these make me wonder if people are capable of thinking anymore. Instead of thinking about what it says and trying to work through it to solve the apparent contradiction, they would rather assume Luke made an error, or “some scribe” goofed in copying the book of Acts. How utterly silly.*

*“The fact is, ALL Greek texts read the same in both accounts. Some modern versions paraphrase what is actually written, in an effort to reconcile the apparent contradiction. Remember, in both cases the verb is the same - akouo - to hear. We get the word acoustics from this Greek word.*

*“Versions like the NASB, NIV and ESV tell us in Acts 9:7 that the men travelling with Paul stood speechless HEARING A VOICE, but seeing no man. But then in Acts 22:9 these three modern versions then tell us that the men did not UNDERSTAND the voice of the one who was speaking to Paul. The verb in both verses is akouo which means to hear. It does not literally mean “to understand”. This would be the verb sunieemi which is found in Acts 7:25 and 28:26 - “but they understood not”, “ye shall hear, and shall not understand”.*

*“Those Bible versions that have correctly translated both Acts 9:7 as “hearing a voice”, and Acts 22:9 as “but they heard not the voice” are: Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Geneva Bible 1599, Young’s, Darby, Douay, the Revised Version 1881, American Standard Version 1901, RSV 1952, NRSV 1989, the NKJV 1982, Goodspeed, Weymouth, Rotherham’s Emphasized Bible 1902, Lamsa’s 1933 translation of the Syriac Peshitta, New English Bible 1970, Today’s English Version 1992, Good News Translation 1992, The Message 2001, the New Living Bible 1998, and even the 2003 Holman Standard Version.*

*“It is very simple to explain this apparent contradiction. We have all experienced being in an auditorium and the speaker will say: “Can you hear me back there?” And the people in the back reply: “No, we can’t hear you. Speak up.” They could “hear” his voice, but they couldn’t make out what he was saying.*

*“Even in Scripture itself we have a clear example of “hearing a voice” but not “hearing” it. In John 12:28-30 we read: “Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. The people therefore, that stood by, and HEARD IT, said that it thundered: others said, An angel spake to him. Jesus answered and said, This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes.”*

*“The people “heard” the voice. They knew there was an audible sound, but some thought it had thundered, and others couldn’t understand what was said, but they did hear something.*

*“Matthew Henry briefly comments on Acts 22:9: “They heard not the voice of him that spoke to Paul, that is, they did not distinctly hear the words.”*

*“John Wesley likewise comments: “They did not hear the voice - Distinctly; but only a confused noise.”*

*“John Calvin remarks in his commentary on Acts 22:9 “I showed in the other place, that there is no such disagreement in the words of Luke as there seemeth to be. Luke said there, that though Paul’s companions stood amazed, yet heard they a voice. (Acts 9:7). But in this place he saith, they heard not the voice of him which spake to Paul though they saw the light. Surely it is no absurd thing to say that they heard some obscure voice; yet so that they did not discern it as Paul himself, whom alone Christ meant to stay and tame with the reprehension. Therefore, they hear a voice, because a sound doth enter into their ears, so that they know that some speaketh from heaven; they hear not the voice of him that spake to Paul, because they understand not what Christ saith.”*

*“There is no contradiction when the two texts are properly put together and understood. The men did hear a voice (Acts 9:7), but they didn’t “hear” it well enough to distinguish what was being said (Acts 22:9). Luke did not make a mistake and there was no scribal*

*error in ALL the manuscripts. The only error is assuming there is an error or contradiction, when none exists."*

White's next attack on the Holy Bible is with respect to the AV1611's reading "**Thou shalt do no murder**" in Matthew 19:18 and "**Thou shalt not kill**" in Romans 13:9. White claims that the contradiction "*is due to the AV rendering, not the actual biblical text.*"

White insists that because "*the very same Greek term*" is used in both verses, the NIV is correct with "*Do not murder*" in each verse. The NASV, NKJV likewise have "*murder*" in each verse.

White attributes (without any evidence) this 'contradiction' to the translation of the AV1611 "*by different committees, each entrusted with a particular section of Scripture. One committee chose "kill," while another chose "murder."* The final editor did not catch such inconsistencies...*You can't speak of editors simply missing a small problem like this when you are endowing those editors with power from on high...Some go so far, as we have noted, to view this as "advanced revelation," superseding the Greek text. Such a position is, obviously, irrational at best.*"

Note that White provides no rationale from any scripture to prove that "*the Greek text*" should remain sacrosanct as the final 'scriptures.' Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>39 p 952ff</sup> remarks from **Chapter 4** again apply.

*"The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to 'the Greek' and downplaying the common man's Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today's pseudo-intellectuals call 'the critical text,' 'the original Greek,' the 'Majority Text,' or the 'Textus Receptus.' There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no 'Dead Bible Society' to translate it into "everyday English," using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors."*

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops'<sup>138</sup> have "*manslaying*," "*kill*," "*kill*" and "*murder*" respectively in Matthew 19:18. Wycliffe has "*slay*" in Romans 13:9 and the others have "*kill*."

Along with the AV1611, Wycliffe, Tyndale, Geneva and Bishops' all include "**Thou shalt not bear false witness**" in Romans 13:9, or similar. The NIV, NASV omit this phrase, in agreement with the JB, NWT, Nestle and the RV, even though Sinaiticus has the words and Origen cites them<sup>8 p 81</sup>. Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 119-120</sup> lists up to 8 uncials, including 8, that contain the words against 8 that don't, namely A, B, D, Dabs (9<sup>th</sup> century), F, G, L, Ψ. The 3<sup>rd</sup> century P46 does not contain the words. The Greek cursive and the Old Latin sources are approximately evenly divided with respect to inclusion versus omission of the phrase, as is the Vulgate.

Dr Moorman states with respect to this verse, "*Ponder the false witness of the persecuting Roman Church.*"

The bibles that prepared and sustained the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation against Rome's persecutions of bible believers were clearly aware of this false witness. White fails to inform his readers of this fact. (He would probably point to the retention of the phrase by the NIV, NASV in Matthew 19:18, Mark 10:19, Luke 18:20 as "*suffi-*

cient,” even though the deletion removes the phrase entirely from Paul’s letters. See remarks in *Chapter 7*, with respect to White’s<sup>3 p 160-1</sup> arrogance in his comments on Mark 10:21.)

Dr Ruckman<sup>121 p 376-7</sup> has this explanation of the AV1611 reading in Matthew 19:18, which would not have occurred to White, though it did to our compassionate Lord and Saviour.

*“The commandment to “not kill” is interpreted by Jesus as “murder,” thus relieving many a combat veteran from a number of complexes put on him by some religious groups...”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 287-9</sup> adds, his emphases, *“We are told that our AV translators were so stupid that they didn’t catch a mistake while reviewing their own work. They translated “phoneuseis” φονευσεις as “murder” one time (Matt. 19:18), and then as “kill” a second time (Rom. 13:9).*

*““You can’t speak of editors simply missing a small problem like this when you are endowing those editors with power from on high...Such a position is, obviously, irrational at best.”*

*“Wait till you see Jimmy’s “position!”*

*“See what he did? He invented another problem that wasn’t there, and then said you were irrational if you didn’t think it was a problem (like HE thought it was!). Let’s see who has the “small problem,” shall we?*

*“How did this blind guide of the blind (the anonymous editor of the AV text) fail to correct both Testaments? Doesn’t Jimmy the Jackleg know that the AV Old Testament translated “Ratsach” (רצח) seven times as “kill,” and twelve times as “murder”?... Well if you are as NUTTY as most Scholarship Only advocates you are to believe that a Greek word cannot be translated two different ways **if it occurs in the Authorized Version.***

*“However, if the same thing occurs in a NASV, or NIV, it is “scholarly”!*

*“Note: the NASV translated the word “skandalizo” (σκανδαλιζω) as “fall away” in Matthew 26:31 and “stumble” in 1 Corinthians 8:13. They also translated “ouranos” (ουρανος) as “sky” in Acts 1:10 and “heaven” in 2 Corinthians 12:2. The NIV translated “porneias” (πορνειας) as “adultery” in Revelation 17:2 and 18:3, 9 but the word is the one used for “fornication.” The Greek word for committing adultery is **not** “porneias”; it is “moicheuontas” (μοιχευοντας, Rev. 2:22).*

*“You see the **facts** are exactly as we stated them. The cult erects **ten different standards for judging the AV** by and, then, they will not apply **one** of them to **their own texts** if it shows their text is not “up to the AV standard.” White’s “assertions” in these matters (see pp. 85, 231 [of *The Scholarship Only Controversy*]) are not “mere assertions,” they are out-and-out **lies**. A man who thinks that anyone cannot translate “φονευσεις” as “murder” and “kill” is **mentally sick**. In addition to that, If he recommends the NIV, or NASV, he is a prejudiced liar. I have news for these hidebound, in “lock-step” traditionalists who think the Holy Spirit cannot translate one word two different ways. The Holy Spirit can freely translate **any** word, or **any** passage, anyway He pleases, since He is the original author.*

*“In Habakkuk 2:4 and Romans 1:17 (and again in Isa. 53:4 and Matt. 8:15) he refuses to go by any “extant” Hebrew or Greek text, and both of the New Testament citations are **translations**. And you think He cannot do it without sitting down with a table full of half-*

*baked, nutty, egotistical idiots who think they are “gods”? James White never studied any “Bible,” how would he know **anything** about what the Holy Spirit did, or could do?*

*“White wrote: “Such a position is obviously IRRATIONAL!” It would be to someone hallucinating on “crack.””*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 453-4</sup> has an incisive note on White’s comments as follows, his emphases.

*“[White’s] own position was not only irrational, it wasn’t even sane. **Anyone** could see that no **translation** translated the same word the same way, **every time**. That is common knowledge.”*

It is also plain from the contexts of Matthew 19:18, Romans 13:9 that the Lord Jesus Christ is explaining the sixth commandment to an individual, whereas Paul is providing a summary list of the commandments for the benefit of his readers. That is why the terms “**murder**” and “**kill**” are used respectively.

White<sup>3 p 230</sup> now attacks the Holy Bible in Acts 19:2, for which he claims that “**since**” in the AV1611 should be “**when**” as in the NIV, NASV – and the JB, NWT, see **Appendix, Table AI**, in addition to the RV (both Nestle and Ricker Berry have a literal reading “*having believed*”). White assumes, incorrectly, that the AV1611 is guilty of teaching “*a second reception of the Holy Spirit*” because, in White’s opinion, the AV1611 “*has Paul asking the disciples in Ephesus if they received the Holy Ghost...subsequent to the act of believing.*”

White then insists that, “*The rendering of the KJV is only marginally possible. It involves a translation that is awkward, uncommon, and inconsistent with all of Paul’s teaching on the subject. This author has been extremely frustrated in attempting to get KJV Only advocates to seriously interact with passages such as this one...The few who have attempted a response have utterly ignored the actual grammar and have, instead, relied upon a rather convoluted interpretation of the passage as their means of getting around a basic problem in translation on the part of the KJV translators.*”

White<sup>3 p 239-240</sup> has 3 notes on Acts 19:2, summarised as follows. The first is with respect to his objection to the term “**Holy Ghost**,” the second is a discussion of the Greek grammatical construction in the verse and the third is a criticism of Dr Ruckman’s<sup>88 p 548-554</sup> exposition of Acts 19:2. White’s criticism is based on a highly selective and unbalanced citation from Dr Ruckman’s commentary.

*“The translation “Holy Ghost” is not only inferior to the more proper rendering “Holy Spirit,” but...the KJV is inconsistent in its rendering of the phrase in the New Testament. For example, while one finds the KJV translating the Greek phrase πνευμα αγιον at Luke 11:13 as “Holy Spirit,” the very same phrase is translated “Holy Ghost” at Luke 2:25...the KJV always capitalizes Holy Ghost, but does not always capitalize Holy Spirit, i.e. Ephesians 1:13, 4:30, where each time the KJV has “holy Spirit.””*

White says of the Greek term, a participle, for “*having believed*” (Ricker Berry) or “*believing*” (Nestle) underlying “**since ye believed**” in the AV1611 and “*when you believed*” in the NIV, NASV, RV, JB, NWT, his emphases, that it “*can refer to an action that is concurrent or simultaneous with the action of the main verb, in this case “received,” that is, which takes place at the same time, or...to an antecedent action, that is, one that takes place **prior** to the action of the main verb...the translation “when you believed” is proper, marking the reception of the Holy Spirit as an action that takes place at the time of belief itself. The KJV rendering uses **antecedent** action, the act of faith preceding the reception of the of the Spirit, making the reception of the Holy Spirit **sub-***

*sequent to faith...which it is not.*” While allowing, therefore, that the AV1611 reading is grammatically possible, White nevertheless maintains that it misleads the reader “*due to a lack of clarity on the KJV’s part.*”

White has based his conclusion on the notion that Acts 19:2 in the AV1611 is “*inconsistent with all of Paul’s teaching on the subject.*” This conclusion is clearly an interpretation and therefore White is ‘inconsistent’ and applying a ‘double standard’ in accusing Dr Ruckman of resorting to an “*interpretation of the passage as [his] means of getting around a basic problem in translation.*”

White inserts a lengthy but highly edited quote from Dr Ruckman’s commentary on Acts and states that, his emphasis, “*Nowhere in this section does Ruckman even **attempt** to deal with the simple fact that the KJV translation chooses an unusual and inferior way of translating the Greek participle. Instead, he ignores the Greek, makes the KJV the standard, and in so doing, ignores the indications of the very grammar of an ancient language so as to maintain the myth of the inerrancy of an English language translation produced nearly 1,600 years after Paul uttered these words in Greek in a land half a world away.*”

What White ignores, as he has throughout his book, is the unparalleled scholarship of the learned men<sup>12 p 13-24, 25 Appendix 1, 39 p 591-612</sup> who translated the AV1611. Of those who translated the Book of Acts, from the New Testament Oxford Company, John Harmar, M.A., and Dr John Perin were both Professors of Greek. Dr Giles Thompson was “*a man of high repute as scholar and preacher,*” Sir Henry Savile was tutor in Greek to Princess, later Queen Elizabeth and the compiler and publisher of “*an eight-volume set...of the works of the great fourth century Greek preacher, John Chrysostom [which] allowed the KJV translators to see first hand, the true text of the earliest Greek New Testament.*”

The other four scholars who worked with these men would have to have been of comparable academic standing and ability.

John Bois was one of the final editors of the 1611 Translation and a professor of Greek. He could read both Greek and Hebrew by the age of six, was admitted to St John’s College Cambridge at the age of fourteen and often devoted himself there to the study of the Greek language from 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

And these men are inadvertently going to choose “*an unusual and inferior way of translating the Greek participle*” resulting in “*a lack of clarity on the KJV’s part*” that must be ‘clarified’ by the likes of James White? What single “*standard*” can White produce to supersede the one that the King’s men established in 1611? White’s book provides no satisfactory answer.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has “*whether ye that believe have received the Holy Ghost?*” This reading approximates to the AV1611. Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all have “*since*” and “*Holy Ghost*” in agreement with the AV1611 in Acts 19:2.

White neglected to include the essential explanation for the AV1611 reading that Dr Ruckman gave in his commentary. It is therefore reproduced<sup>8 p 166-7</sup> here, with updated references. ‘Our critic’ had a similar problem with Acts 19:2. The underlined portions of the quote are the essential components of Dr Ruckman’s explanation that White omitted, thereby misleading his readers. Dr Ruckman explains why the AV1611 translation “*since*” is not “*unusual and inferior.*”

“*Our critic’s next “error” is in Acts 19:2 where “since” in the AV1611 should apparently be “when” as found in the NIV, JB, NWT...*”

*“Dr. Ruckman<sup>88 p 548-552</sup>, states: “The New ASV (as the old one) has inserted “WHEN” for “SINCE” in verse 2. Then this necessitates altering “HAVE YE?” to “did you?” And just to make sure the verse no longer bears any resemblance to the hated King James Bible, the word “GHOST” has been altered to “Spirit”...The “baptism of repentance” (vs. 4) which John preached (vs. 4) was NOT the baptism of the Holy Ghost (Acts 1:5), and John told his audience that when they quizzed him (Matthew 3:11).*

*““They had NOT received the HOLY GHOST “since” they believed for they were in the same position that the Samaritan converts were in Acts 8. “We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost” (vs. 2)...“Unto what then were ye baptized?” (vs. 3). Well, John was baptizing in his own name so they were baptized unto John, just as Israel was baptized “unto” Moses (Cf. 1 Corinthians 10:1-4, Matthew 3:7, 21:25, Mark 11:30, Luke 7:29). It is “John’s Baptism,” NOT CHRIST’S...Not a word about John’s statement which he made on the baptism of the Holy Ghost (Matthew 3:11), and therefore, these “interim” converts, halfway between Matthew 3 and Acts 2:38, match their master (Apollos) who was caught in the same transitional place (18:25).”*

*“Dr. Ruckman comments on how these men speak in tongues after the laying on of Paul’s hands, verse 6: “In the Corinthians Epistle, the Bible believer was first told that tongues were a “sign” (1 Corinthians 14:22) to ISRAEL (Isaiah 28:11,12); then he was told that prophecy (1 Corinthians 14:22) served the BELIEVER. Paul is a believer, hence the double notice of Acts 19:6: “they spake with tongues, AND prophesied...” the passage was interpreted in 1 Corinthians 14:22 more than 18 centuries before any British scholar (or American scholar) changed “since” to “when”. Obviously Apollos’ converts had not been baptized according to Matthew 28:19, 20 or Acts 2:38, for the HOLY GHOST is mentioned in connection with both baptisms! The only fair question to ask then is, “Unto what then were you baptized?”[Acts 19:3]”*

*““The AV (1611) text is infallible, absolute truth as it stands, and no “God-breathed originals” would shed any more light on it than the light it already has in the God-honoured Reformation text of 1611.””*

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 194-8</sup> has these additional comments on Acts 19:2 and White’s criticisms of the AV1611, his emphases.

*“According to the Scholarship Only advocates, Acts 19:2, in a **King James Bible**, is the dirty felon who is responsible for a massive wave of falsehood, and the destruction of “entire theologies.” After the NIV and NASV “doctored” the verse up, it told the truth it should have to start with. Jimmy’s goofy theology is that the NASV straightens everyone out theologically by retranslating “SINCE ye believed” to “WHEN ye believed”...*

*“James White, like his blind guides, believed some pastor (or pastors) who was fighting the Charismatic movement, and both of these blind neophytes decided that all the trouble was due to the word “SINCE” in a **King James Text**...*

*“Now watch the Holy Scriptures...pierce these stupid, bloated, puffed Nicolaitans slap through their courteous, cool, objective, superb, sweet talking, **godly** guts (Heb. 4:12-13)...*

*“1. The most shocked people in Caesarea (Acts 10:45) were saved Jews who saw Gentiles receive the Holy Ghost **WHEN they believed** (Acts 10:44). Why was this?...*

*“2. The Biblical **fact**, supported by every verse in the New Testament, in **any** edition, of **any** translation on earth, is that all of the Jews expected the Gentiles to receive the Holy*



Ghost **after** they believed, and **after** they were baptized. Look at the passage (Acts 10:45). **That** is why they were shocked.

“3. There are **two** receptions of the Holy Spirit **after** belief: one was the apostles themselves (Acts 2 coming **AFTER** John 20:22). Two : in Acts 8:15 where they had believed but the Holy Spirit had not fallen on them Acts 8:16...

“4. EVERY CONVERT OF JOHN THE BAPTIST (see Acts 18:25) FROM MATTHEW, CHAPTER 3 TO MATTHEW, CHAPTER 28 BELIEVED WITHOUT RECEIVING THE HOLY SPIRIT. Check any set of references in **any** translation of **any** Bible (in **any** edition) that ever showed up on this earth. The “ei” (εἰ) had to be translated as “**SINCE**” for if it had been translated as anything else it would have been **a vicious lie** contradicting all of the historical material from AD 30-34 found in Matthew, chapter 3 to Acts, chapter 10. The Analytical Greek Lexicon, 1970, p. 116 says “**SINCE**.” That time, the stupid **LIAR** lied **three times in a row** to cover up the fact that **he** was unable to read an English New Testament. He lied about the AV being to blame for messing people up theologically. He lied about the AV translation, calling it “awkward.” And then he lied about the **reason** why the AV used “**since**.” Not content with three lies in a row, Jimmy adds another sin to his pile of sins.

““A translation (AV) that is awkward, uncommon, and **INCONSISTENT WITH ALL OF PAUL’S TEACHING** on the subject.”

“**Paul, in Acts 19:1, is not dealing with one saved Christian in the Body of Christ.** Whitey couldn’t READ...Paul’s “teaching on the subject” (found in Romans-Philemon) would not even be **RELATED** to Acts 19:1-2. Paul doesn’t write to **disciples of John the Baptist**, who have heard a partial revelation from a man who had not been born again (see Acts 18:25).

“James White lied again, that is sixty to this point...”

“In White’s chaotic thinking, everyone from John the Baptist (Matt. 3; Mark 1; Luke 3) to Acts, chapter 19 to Matthew, chapter 28 got the Holy Spirit **WHEN they believed: NONE OF THEM DID.**”

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 186-7, 164</sup> has these comments on Acts 19:2 and White’s criticisms of the AV1611.

“As with so many other examples in this lesson, this verse [Acts 19:2] is objected to by James R. White in his book, *The King James Only Controversy*. Brother White states,

““One of the well-known problems in the AV is found in Acts 19:2... The King James Version has Paul asking the disciples in Ephesus if they received the Holy Ghost since they believed, that is, subsequent to the act of believing. All modern translations, however, translate the passage, ‘when you believed.’ The difference is not a slight one. Entire theologies of a second reception of the Holy Spirit have been based upon this one rendering by the KJV. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is materially impacted by how one translates this passage...This author has been extremely frustrated in attempting to get KJV Only advocates to seriously interact with passages such as this one.” (p. 230).

“Those of us who have personally had ongoing exchanges of information and correspondence with Brother White, find the last phrase of utmost interest. In a series of online debates with James White and in writing a published critique of his book, I can say with all confidence that **THIS** author has been extremely frustrated in attempting to get James R. White to seriously interact with passages, textual data, and historical information

where he has clearly provided information which lacks veracity. However, let us address the issue he claims KJV advocates ignore.

*“None of the Greek words used for “since” or “when” are in this verse. Instead, we must look at the construction of the Greek. The phrase, “Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed, “ reads in Greek as, “Ei pneuma agion elabete pisteusantes.” A literal translation would be, “[The] Spirit/Ghost Holy did ye receive, having believed?” The phrase in question stands in the Greek aorist. This refers to past time; thus, we have the past tense with the words “received” and “believed.” Therefore, the translation put forth by White and others is quite correct as it relates to the Greek itself. However, the English word “since” also reflects past tense and is correct as it relates to the Greek text. Dana and Mantey address the use of the aorist. They write, “The fundamental significance of the aorist is to denote action simply as occurring, without reference to its progress.” (A Manual Grammar Of The Greek New Testament Toronto: Macmillan, 1927, p.193) Therefore, the words “since” or “when” both reflect the proper use of the aorist. In reference to what is called the Culminative Aorist, Dana and Mantey add,*

*““The aorist is employed in this meaning when it is wished to view an event in its entirety, but to regard it from the viewpoint of its existing results. Here we usually find verbs which signify effort or process, the aorist denoting the attainment of the end of such effort or process.” (Ibid., pp. 196-197).*

*“In this regard, the translation of “since” is proper as it relates to the aorist tense. For it can indicate a past action, but one which was attained through a process. Dr. George Ladd (Fuller Theological Seminary) recognizes this and states, “The Greek participle is having believed, and it is capable of being translated either since ye believed (AV) or when you believed (RSV).” (The Wycliffe Bible Commentary Nashville: The Southwest Company, 1962, p. 1160). Although Dr. Ladd prefers the word “when,” he does not claim that “since” is a translational error which will lead to doctrinal error, as claimed by White. In fact, Dr. Ladd plainly states that both translations are possible. Since Mr. White received his M.A. from Fuller Theological Seminary (where Dr. Ladd taught), it is a shame that he did not make himself aware of Dr. Ladd’s comments concerning Acts 19:2.*

*“In White’s noted objection, he indicates that the doctrine which teaches the Holy Spirit is bestowed upon the believer after salvation and not at the time of salvation, is the result of the King James Version. Among many Charismatic and Pentecostal Christians, the doctrine is taught that a person who is saved must later receive the Holy Ghost (usually with “evidences” such as speaking in tongues). And, it is true that some have used this passage as a proof text for that doctrine. However, to credit the translators of the KJV for providing this doctrine is somewhat ridiculous. First of all, the translators of the KJV were Anglican and Puritan, neither of which are proponents of such a doctrine. Secondly, we would have to ask ourselves why many Charismatics and Pentecostals have embraced modern versions which have removed the word “since” and replaced it with “when.” In fact, the NIV had translators who support the very doctrine to which Brother White is objecting.*

*“Regardless of our personal interpretation of the doctrine concerning the receiving of the Holy Ghost, we cannot allow such doctrine to affect the translation of the word of God. James White, in allowing his doctrine to translate for him, is faced with a paradox. If we reject the translation “since” in verse two and replace it with “when” because we believe that the Holy Ghost is received instantly at the very time of salvation, what do we do with the context of the passage? After all, context does count. As we consider the text,*

we find that Paul confronts a group of “believers” who never heard of the Holy Ghost, nor of personal salvation in Jesus Christ. These were believers in the teaching of John the Baptist and were still looking for the coming Messiah. Paul, in turn, then preaches to these Jews the person of Christ. After which, we read,

““When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the LORD Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.” (vs. 5-6)

“The context teaches that these former followers of John first believe, then are baptized, and THEN receive the Holy Ghost with the laying on of hands by the Apostle Paul. The text shows that they received the Holy Ghost “since” they believed. Those who have historically and contextually recognized this, have not all taught that the Holy Ghost is received following salvation as a second blessing. Instead, they teach that the Holy Ghost comes to believers at the time of salvation. This passage is looked upon as transitional, and that these followers of John needed the laying on of hands by Paul in order to show Apostolic authority, not a need for a second blessing. Therefore, this act became their Pentecost.”

Dr Holland’s analysis is independent of Dr Ruckman’s but reaches the same scriptural conclusion, with respect to **“rightly dividing the word of truth”** 2 Timothy 2:15b. Will Kinney<sup>173</sup> has these informative comment on Acts 19:2.

“The purpose of this study is to refute the allegations made by people like James White and others who tell us the King James Bible is not the inerrant, complete and 100% true words of God. Mr. James White is a prime example of those who CLAIM to believe in the inerrancy of Scripture, yet have no inerrant Bible to recommend to anyone.

“In his book, *The King James Only Controversy*, Mr. White makes some amazing statements, while at the same time alleging the King James Bible to be in error in numerous places. In Chapter Nine, titled *Problems in the KJV*, on pages 223-224, Mr. White assures us about his book that “this work is not anti-KJV. I have no desire to “bash” the AV...Over and over again I have explained to individuals that I am not against the KJV, only to find them accusing me of dishonesty in return...Still it is vital to emphasize that demonstrating errors in the KJV in no way demonstrates errors in the “Bible”...Passing over the plain errors in the AV would allow their assertions to go unquestioned and unrefuted. When they claim the KJV is inspired and inerrant, the demonstration of errors in that translation effectively (for anyone willing to follow the truth to its logical conclusions) ends the debate.”

“I would first like to ask Mr. White that if he is not publishing his work to “bash the AV”, then why did he write his 271 page book claiming “errors in the KJV” on almost every page? If there are errors in the King James Bible, then what is Mr. White referring to when he says he is not demonstrating errors in “the Bible”? Apparently Mr. White does not consider the KJB to be “the Bible”. The simple fact is, Mr. James White does not believe “the Bible” exists that does not contain errors. He even corrects his own NASB. The only “inerrant Bible” James believes in is the imaginary and mystical bible he keeps making up as he goes along, and his “bible” differs from everybody else’s.

“On page 238 Mr. White says: “I fully believe the Word of God IS INERRANT.” The truth is Mr. White does not believe there is such a thing as the inerrant words of God in any Bible or any single text in any language anywhere on this earth. His real position is that ONLY the non-existent and never seen by him “originals WERE inspired and inerrant”, but James has no such thing NOW, and he knows it. For James White to SAY he

*believes in something HE KNOWS does not exist, and cannot show to anyone alive today, is not (in his own words) “to follow the truth to its logical conclusions”. Not one time in his entire book does Mr. White ever tell the reader where they can find for themselves a copy of “the inerrant word of God” he says he fully believes in.*

*“Throughout his book Mr. White criticizes the King James Bible and recommends instead three different modern bible translations he calls “reliable versions” - the NKJV, NASB and the NIV. Yet these three “reliable versions”, especially the NKJV when compared to the NIV, NASB, differ from each other in literally thousands of words, and hundreds of verses.*

*“The NKJV is generally based (though not always) on the Traditional Greek Text that underlies the King James Bible, but the NASB, NIV omit some 3000 words and many whole verses in just the New Testament that are found in his recommended NKJV. In addition to this, both the NASB and NIV frequently reject the Hebrew texts (but not always in the same places) and follow instead the Syriac, LXX, Vulgate, or else flat out “make up” different readings. I can prove every one of these allegations. Yet Mr. White calls these three multiple-choice, contradictory and conflicting bibles “reliable translations”. Never once does he refer to anything on paper and ink bound between two covers as “the inerrant word of God”...*

*“Acts 19:2 “Have you received the Holy Ghost SINCE ye believed?”*

*“On page 230 of his book, The KJV Only Controversy, Mr. White lists both the KJB and the NASB readings of this verse. The NASB says: “Did you receive the Holy Spirit WHEN you believed?” Then Mr. White says: “The King James Version has Paul asking the disciples in Ephesus if they received the Holy Ghost SINCE they believed, that is, subsequent to the act of believing. All modern translations, however, translate the passage “WHEN you believed.” The difference is not a slight one. Entire theologies of a second reception of the Holy Spirit have been based upon this one rendering by the KJV. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is materially impacted by how one translates this passage”...*

*“One of the things that is of interest in Mr. White’s comments on the grammar of the King James reading is that here he says it is “only marginally possible”, but later, on page 239 he goes into more detail. There he explains in a much fairer manner that the aorist participle (“since ye believed” or “when you believed”) CAN BE TRANSLATED in two ways. “It can refer to an action that is simultaneous with the action of the main verb, (NASB, NKJV, NIV) OR it can refer to an action that takes place PRIOR TO the action of the main verb.” (KJB and others)*

*“What Mr. White apparently fails to notice is the CONTEXT of Acts 19:2. In Acts 18:24 through Acts 19:7 we are told about a certain Jew named Apollos who came to Ephesus “who taught diligently the things of the Lord, KNOWING ONLY THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.” Paul then later came to that same city of Ephesus, and found certain disciples. After asking them if they had received the Holy Ghost AFTER they believed, they told him that they hadn’t even heard of the Holy Ghost. He then asks them: “Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John’s baptism.”*

*““Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And WHEN Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.”*

*“The clear facts of the CONTEXT show us that these disciples were indeed believers in the message that John the Baptist had preached. They believed that the Messiah was yet to come, but were unaware of the fact that He had already come, died and rose again. They already were believers, but they had not yet received the Holy Ghost because they had not yet heard the whole gospel...”*

*“Barnes’ Notes on the New Testament says: “And finding certain disciples. Certain persons who had been baptized into John’s baptism, and who had embraced John’s doctrine, that the Messiah was soon to appear, Acts 19:3,4. It is very clear that they had not yet heard that he had come, or that the Holy Ghost was given. They were evidently in the same situation as Apollos.*

*““Verse 2. Have ye received the Holy Ghost Since ye believed? Since you embraced the doctrine of John, that the Messiah was soon to come. We have not so much as heard, etc. This seems to be a very remarkable and strange answer. Yet we are to remember,*

*“(1.) that these were mere disciples of John’s doctrine, and that his preaching related particularly to the Messiah, and not to the Holy Ghost.*

*“(2.) It does not even appear that they had heard that the Messiah had come, or had heard of Jesus of Nazareth, Acts 19:4,5.*

*“(3.) It is not remarkable, therefore, that they had no clear conceptions of the character and operations of the Holy Ghost.”...*

*“The People’s New Testament commentary notes: “Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? This question is asked in order to lead their way to a knowledge of their imperfect obedience....they had heard nothing of the scenes of Pentecost and the descent of the Spirit. It must not be forgotten that they lived nearly a thousand miles from Jerusalem, in an age when each part of the world knew little of what transpired elsewhere. Unto what then were ye baptized? The fact that these disciples “know nothing of the Holy Spirit being given,” showed that there was something wrong about their baptism. Unto John’s baptism. Why, then, were these disciples re-baptized? The only explanation is that their baptism took place after John’s baptism had been superseded by that of Christ, or after the Savior had been crucified. John verily baptized. His baptism was (1) of Repentance; (2) of Faith in a coming Savior. Christian baptism is (1) of Repentance; (2) of Faith in a Savior that has come, died, risen, and been exalted to the heavens.”*

*“Agreeing with the King James Bible reading of “Have ye received the Holy Ghost SINCE ye believed?” are the following Bible translations: Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Bishops’ Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599...the Spanish Reina Valera 1909 (Habéis recibido el Espíritu Santo DESPUES QUE creísteis?), the Italian Diodati, Lamsa’s 1936 translation of the Syriac Peshitta (Have you received the Holy Spirit SINCE you were converted)...*

*“In his criticism of the King James readings of both Acts 19:2 and Ephesians 1:13, in which being sealed with the Holy Ghost occurs AFTER we believe the gospel, James White assures us that the KJB reading “is inconsistent”. OK, then let’s look at what the New Testament actually teaches regarding this doctrine.*

*“In the book of Acts we have several accounts of different groups of people hearing and believing the gospel. The very first and obvious group is that of the disciples and apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. They all obviously had already believed the gospel of the death*

*and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, but had not yet received the Holy Ghost. This is clear from numerous passages.*

*“Acts 1:5 “For John truly baptized with water; by ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” It wasn’t until Pentecost that the apostles were filled with the Holy Ghost.*

*“In Acts 8:5-17 we are presented with a group of Samaritans who hear the gospel preached by Philip and they believe. Then the apostles at Jerusalem hear that the Samaritans had received the word of God, and they send Peter and John “who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.”*

*“Clearly, these Christians had heard and believed the gospel BEFORE they had received the Holy Ghost.*

*“What about the apostle Paul? In Acts 9 we have his conversion reported. The ascended Lord knocks him off his high horse, appears to him in a vision, and tells him that He is Jesus whom Paul is persecuting. Paul obviously at this point believes in Jesus. Yet in Acts 9:17 brother Ananias is sent by the Lord to go to Paul, and tells him: “Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost.” Paul believed in Christ before he was filled with the Holy Ghost.*

*“Some would then argue, and not without some reason, that the first group were Jews and the second group were Samaritans. OK, but how about the pattern for the Gentiles? This we see in Acts chapter 10. Here we see a man named Cornelius “that feared God with all his house...and prayed to God alway.” An angel of God appears to him and tells him to send for Peter. Peter then comes to the household of Cornelius and begins to preach the gospel, and while he is preaching the Holy Ghost “fell on all them which heard the word.” Later on, at the council in Jerusalem, Peter tells the other apostles: “Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us.”*

*“The pattern here for the Gentiles is: 1. heard the gospel. 2. believed. 3. were given the Holy Ghost. This is not a “Charismatic second blessing” type of thing I’m talking about at all. You only receive the Holy Ghost one time. God’s work of conversion is hard to divide up into sections, but the Biblical pattern seems to be that one hears the gospel when God opens the heart, they believe the gospel, and then God seals them with the holy Spirit of promise as an earnest of our inheritance. Every person who now hears the gospel and believes in Christ as his Saviour, is then subsequently sealed by God with the holy Spirit.”*

All three of the above commentators have independently noted the transitional nature of some conversions recorded in the Book of Acts. The King’s men allowed for it in their translation of Acts 19:2, with the support of the faithful pre-1611 English bibles and faithful translations from overseas. Again, White’s criticisms of the Holy Bible are found to be invalid.

White’s objection to the term **“Holy Ghost”** – see above – has been countered by the witness of the pre-1611 English bibles, including Wycliffe but Dr Bouw<sup>174 p 220-221, 224-5</sup> has these informative comments, showing that the King’s men were correct in their use of the term.

*“The word “ghost” is not applied in the Authorized Bible in the sense of the spirit of a deceased person. These are called spirits in Mt. 14:26; Mk. 6:49; Lu. 24:37 and 39: and the ghost of Peter is called his “angel” in Ac. 12:15. So the modern English usage of “ghost” as the spirit of the deceased was evidently not known to, or ignored by the King James translators. In any case, they did not relate it to the phrase “give up the ghost” (Mark 15:37 etc.). Ghost is an old English word which was originally a contraction of two words: “God’s host,” which became “G’host” and then “Ghost.” Similarly, the German word for spirit, geist, also relates to the English ghost. In the Germanic language, the word is related to gast which is the same word as the English “guest.” Ghost (geist) stemmed from that in the sense of a spirit which is the guest of the body. With reference to God’s host, the ancients acknowledged that the spirit of man belongs to God and is thus God’s host to the body and soul...”*

The Spirit of God as God’s Host would therefore enable the spirit of the child of God to be indwelt by the Persons of the Godhead, 1 Corinthians 3:16, 2 Corinthians 6:16, Ephesians 3:17. Dr Bouw continues.

*“An astute student of the Bible may ask about Luke 11:13, where the words “Holy Spirit” appear together in a context which looks as if it should be rendered “Holy Ghost,” if the King James translators were consistent:*

***“If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?”***

*“The resolution to this is that the Holy Ghost is given to all believers, they do not have to ask for him. But here the “evil” listeners, the disciples, need to ask for the Holy Spirit...Jesus is still with them, he had not yet paid the penalty for their sins. They were still in the Old Testament dispensation where the Holy Ghost is unknown because he was not yet given in full, only in part.*

*“Next we need to answer the question of whether or not the Greek New Testament knows of the Holy Ghost, especially since it cannot distinguish between ghost and spirit. For this we refer to the section quote, Acts 19:2, where Paul encounters the disciples of Apollos. Paul asks them:*

***“Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.”***

*“These were learned men (see the context), well versed in the Old Testament. They could not have missed the holy Spirit of the Old Testament, but they’ve never heard of the Holy Ghost. One could ask how they could tell the holy Spirit and Holy Ghost apart in the Greek (Greek is so devoid of understanding in this matter that it cannot even distinguish between spirit and breath), but these all are Jews and they probably conversed in Hebrew. Remember that Hebrew can and does distinguish between spirit and ghost. When Luke translated the conversation into Greek, the distinction became implicit (internal) instead of explicit (obvious). Evidently the Authorized Bible translators read the Greek more closely than their modern counterparts.*

*“Next, let’s look at the New Testament occurrences of “holy Spirit.”*

***“Ephesians 1:13 In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise.***

***“Ephesians 4:30 And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.***

*“1 Thessalonians 4:8 He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his holy Spirit.*

*“In all three cases the role of the holy Spirit is passive and not present in the fullness to require it be translated as Holy Ghost. It is a seal, or it is given to the reader who may or may not be a believer [i.e. in the sense that, from Acts 2 to the Rapture, the Spirit of God has been given to be received by faith, so that the recipient is “in Christ” 2 Corinthians 5:17]. This brings up the last distinction of the Holy Ghost. His “job description” in John 16 includes reproof of the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; and he will glorify Jesus and reveal the things of Jesus. He will guide the disciples into all truth, and he shall not speak of himself. In that same passage Jesus tells his disciples that the Holy Ghost cannot come until Christ’s work on earth is done. The Holy Ghost does not descend onto the church until he came in Acts 2, after Jesus had been taken up to heaven. It is this witness to the death burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ which sets the Holy Ghost apart from the holy Spirit.*

*“When all these factors are taken into consideration, it is apparent that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Trinity. The Trinity consists of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.”*

And therefore Paul could say, ***“For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power”*** Colossians 2:9, 10.

See also Will Kinney’s analysis, [www.geocities.com/brandplucked/HolyGhost.html](http://www.geocities.com/brandplucked/HolyGhost.html).

White now accuses the AV1611 of “inconsistency” in Genesis 50:20, where ***“ye thought evil...God meant it unto good”*** should in his opinion be “*you meant evil...God meant it for good*” as in the NASV, or perhaps “*intended*” as in the NIV or “*planned*” as in the JB. The NWT’s “*in mind*” agrees approximately with the AV1611’s “*thought*.”

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Coverdale<sup>167</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all have “*thought*” in agreement with the AV1611 and “*turned it into good*” for the second part of the expression, except for the Geneva, which has “*disposed*” instead of “*turned*.” So according to White, these pre-1611 bibles that God used to bring in the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation also are inferior, compared with the NIV, NASV that God has patently ignored for the best part of half a century.

Whites states, his emphases, “*The Hebrew text provides a plain parallel here that is obscured by the curious KJV translation. Joseph told his brothers that while they had meant their actions for evil ends, God had meant the same actions for good ends. The KJV introduces a distinction that is not found in the text it is translating.*”

Then well done to the KJV for bringing out a distinction that is not evident in the Hebrew ☺!

Will Kinney<sup>175</sup> has this response to White’s complaint about Genesis 50:20 in the AV1611.

*“Genesis 50:20 Ye thought - God meant...*

*“For some reason, perhaps known only to himself, Mr. James White has a bee in his bonnet about how the King James Bible renders this verse. In his book, The King James Only Controversy, on page 230 Mr. White says regarding the KJV: “Another example of inconsistency can be found at Genesis 50:20. The Hebrew text provides a plain parallel here that is obscured by the curious KJV translation. Joseph told his brothers that while*



*they had MEANT their actions for evil ends, God had MEANT the same actions for good ends. The KJV introduces a distinction that is not to be found in the text it is translating.”*

*“I’ll wager that most people who have read this passage as it stands in the King James Bible have never had the thought jump out to them “You know, that just doesn’t seem right. They missed that plain Hebrew parallel.”*

*“I was once involved with James White in an online discussion about the Bible version issue and we addressed this particular verse. Here is part of our conversation. (<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/realtruthradio/message/87>)*

*“I said: “James, I will be happy to address Genesis 50:20. I thought it was one of your more ridiculous criticisms. Why don’t you tell us all what is wrong with the KJB reading, so we will all be clear on why you consider it to be an error, and then I will be glad to respond”.*

*“James then posts:...*

*““The Hebrew presents a strict parallel, “you (Joseph’s brothers) MEANT (chashav) evil” and then “God MEANT (chashav) it for good.” Translating the verb as “thought evil” and then “meant it unto good” obscures the parallel that is so important in demonstrating compatibilism in this passage. It is not that the KJV is WRONG but that it is INFERIOR to the modern translations of the passage, including that of the NKJV: Genesis 50:20 “But as for you, you meant evil against me; [but] God meant it for good, in order to bring it about as [it is] this day, to save many people alive. (NKJ) So, upon what basis do you argue for the superiority of obscuring the parallel that is clear in the original tongue?” - James White. (<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/realtruthradio/message/87>)*

*“You see, Mr. White doesn’t have nor believe in a perfect, infallible Bible. He “uses” the NASB a lot, but doesn’t mind correcting it when he feels it goes against his final authority for determining both text and meaning. What final authority might this be? Well, simply put, it is his own mind and understanding. James is a professional Bible corrector and nobody has really gotten it right yet after all these attempts to give us God’s words - not the KJB, RV, ASV, NKJV, NIV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV - none of them. James should write his own bible version and be done with it: that is the only way he will be satisfied. It also would make him very happy if his made up bible version gained him boatloads of money and worldwide fame.*

*“What James fails to notice is that many other Bible translators, just as qualified as himself, have not seen fit to render this verse in the same way he “thinks” (or should that be “means”?) to translate it...*

*“Not only does the King James Bible translate this section as “ye THOUGHT...but God MEANT”, but so also do the 1936 Jewish translation put out by the Hebrew Publishing Company of New York...*

*“The Geneva Bible of 1599 says: “ye THOUGHT evil against me, but God DISPOSED it to good” while the Coverdale bible 1535, Bishops’ Bible 1568, and Wycliffe 1395 all read: “Ye THOUGHT evil against me, but God TURNED it unto good”...*

*“The word used here has many meanings. In fact the NASB that Mr. White uses, when it suits his needs, has rendered this same word as not only “meant”, but also “thought”(5 times), account, purpose, consider, compose, calculate, devise, esteem, execute, to make, to have, intend, pondered, reckoned, regard, require, scheme, seem, skilful, value and workman.*

*“It really bothers Mr. White that the King James Bible says “ye thought... but God meant it unto good”, even though the meaning is the same as the new versions he promotes, and several other translators have rendered the phrase the same way as the KJB. However, it doesn’t seem to bother him that in this same verse both the NASB and NIV have changed the literal meaning of the Hebrew “as it is THIS DAY”.*

*“The KJB, RV, ASV, NKJV, and Young’s all say: “God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, AS IT IS THIS DAY, to save much people alive.” The Hebrew here for “this day” is two words...this, and...yom - day. Yet the NASB says: “to bring about THIS PRESENT RESULT” (“present result” replacing the literal word “day”), while the NIV paraphrases with: “to accomplish WHAT IS NOW BEING DONE” ...*

*“Mr. White seems content to strain at gnats in the KJB, and neglects to point out the liberties these other versions take with the literal Hebrew. Such is the mind of a Bible corrector.*

*“I think Mr. White is pretty hard up to find some kind of “error” in the King James Bible and will go to almost any ridiculous extreme to produce one. This is just another silly example from the fertile mind of someone who sets himself up as the final authority regarding the true words of God. Mr. White cannot tell you where you can get a copy of God’s preserved words in any language, including “the” Hebrew and “the” Greek. Why? Because he doesn’t have one. I have read his book several times and never found out where I can get a copy of an infallible Bible. He will recommend several “reliable translations”, all of which contradict each other hundreds of times in both text and meaning, but not even these are perfect according to Mr. White. If you want to know what God REALLY said, you have to ask Mr. James White. Want a second opinion? Ask him again.”*

The scripture itself shows that the AV1611 is quite correct to introduce “a distinction that is not found in the text it is translating” – if indeed it isn’t.

***“And when they saw him afar off, even before he came near unto them, they conspired against him to slay him”*** Genesis 37:18.

***“For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies”*** Matthew 15:19.

The conspiracy against Joseph started in his brothers’ hearts and was translated into action by means of thoughts and words. The AV1611 reveals this sequence and is therefore superior to the modern versions, NIV, NASV that do not.

Like ‘our critic,’<sup>8 p 179-182</sup> James White maintains that “Names cause no end of difficulty for the reader of the KJV...The translators sometimes use the Hebrew form, sometimes a Greek form, sometimes even a Latin form!” ‘Our critic’ likewise alluded pejoratively to these different forms of proper names in the AV1611 in his original diatribe against the Holy Bible that he forwarded to me. Many of his examples e.g. “Jeremiah, Jeremias and Jeremie,” “Noah and Noe,” “Jonah, Jona and Jonas,” “Elijah and Elias,” “Joshua and Jesus,” “Timothy and Timotheus”” match those about which White complains.

Yet no more than 3 pages further on his book, White<sup>3 p 234</sup> introduces a section that he entitles “The Changing English Language,” in which he states, loosely, “Languages change. They evolve and grow...The fact that languages change over time is one of the strongest arguments for either the revision of older translations of the Bible [still unspecified], or for completely new translations.”

However, when the AV1611 modifies proper names to reflect a change in language – even if between languages instead of within a language - it is nevertheless still at fault because, supposedly “*Names cause no end of difficulty for the reader of the KJV.*”

They never have for this author. They have instead served to emphasise that the AV1611 is “*the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever*” 1 Peter 1:23b, for the very reason that the name changes in the text reflect changes in language, though White would probably dismiss that view as ‘subjective’ or otherwise inappropriate. Nevertheless, he does appear once again to be ‘inconsistent’ and exhibiting a ‘double standard.’

Moreover, the only individual that White can identify with respect to experiencing “*difficulty*” over name changes in the AV1611 is the Mormon founder, Joseph Smith<sup>3 p 241</sup>, who thought Elijah and Elias were different individuals.

Smith has been described<sup>176</sup> as “*an occultic opportunist...who blended Masonic rituals into his temple rituals.*” Why shouldn’t the Holy Bible have deceived this bible-rejecting demoniac?

**“With the pure thou wilt shew thyself pure; and with the froward thou wilt shew thyself forward”** Psalm 18:26.

Dr Ruckman<sup>128 p 60</sup> notes, his emphases, “*The AV has been arraigned as a criminal before Judge Jeffries, (brain – 3 pounds, 4 ounces), with charges of “confusing folks.” Some of our brethren [e.g. James White] have forgotten that one of the express offices of the word of God is to DECEIVE AND RUIN A MAN! (2 Thess. 2:11-12, 2 Cor. 2:16, Matt. 13:11-15, Ezek. 14:1-11)...*

*“The word is a two-edged sword. In many places it is designedly obscure, if for no other reason than to stimulate the inquirer to search the scriptures diligently. Men who are forty to seventy years old can be seen, sitting two hours at a time, with their eyes glued to a thirty-five cent dirty detective story, trying to figure out “who done it,” and yet the same men will not spend five minutes trying to reconcile Acts 9:6, 7 with Acts 22:9 [James White didn’t, he simply altered the text – see above]. Is the Almighty Creator IGNORANT of this hypocrisy?”*

Of name changes that “*cause no end of difficulty for the reader of the KJV,*” and which according to ‘our critic’ represent a “*lack of uniformity*” that “*only creates perplexities and confuses many readers,*” the same comments from this author’s earlier work apply, with updated references.

*“[Our critic] gives NO INDICATION WHATSOEVER of WHO was “confused”, of WHO was “misled”, of WHAT the “disastrous consequences” were or what the RESULTS were of anyone having been “confused” or “misled”. Neither does he indicate who was “perplexed” by the “lack of uniformity” in the spellings of names or what were the consequences of such “perplexity”. Nevertheless, I am supposed to accept WITHOUT QUESTION his unsubstantiated opinion that all this “confusion” and “perplexity” has arisen “for MANY readers”, with “disastrous consequences”.*

*“One is reminded of the comments of Burgon<sup>13 p 26</sup>, with respect to the “recension theory” of Westcott and Hort:*

*““It dispenses with proof. It furnishes no evidence. It asserts when it ought to argue. It reiterates when it is called on to explain...“I am sir Oracle.””*

*“Dr. Ruckman<sup>18 p 148</sup>, comments: “It is objected that the word “Jeremiah” has been transliterated three different ways in the AV1611 (Matt. 27:9, 16:14, 2:14). This is “con-*

*fusing to the reader.” It didn’t confuse Moody, Torrey, Finney, Sunday, Spurgeon, Scofield, Carey, Goforth, Livingstone, DeHaan, Fuller, Ironsides, Rice, or anyone else who believed the Bible and PUT IT INTO PRACTICE. WHOM DID IT “CONFUSE?”*”

Apart from his irrelevant reference to the demoniac Joseph Smith, James White fails to answer Dr Ruckman’s question. White also fails to appreciate that the AV1611 variation in names reflects current English usage, e.g. John, Ian, Sean, Shane, Catherine, Katherine, Katrina, Alan, Allan, Allen, Alun, Gill, Jil, Jill, Robin, Robbin, Robyn, Robynn, Robynne, Susan, Suzanne, Susannah etc. Where has White been? He should check here, [www.thinkbabynames.com/list/1/A](http://www.thinkbabynames.com/list/1/A).

The AV1611 is therefore more up to date than the modern versions that have imposed a uniform translation on various names in the scriptures.

White also thinks that Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8 refer exclusively to Joshua in the Old Testament. They do not. And of the pre-1611 bibles, Tyndale<sup>47</sup> and Coverdale<sup>167</sup> have “Joshua” but Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all have “Jesus” in agreement with the AV1611.

Tyndale and Coverdale appear on this rare occasion to have given way to interpretation, instead of abiding by translation. In God’s providence, the Geneva and Bishops’ bibles restored Wycliffe’s correct reading, preserved in the AV1611.

‘Our critic’ raised an objection to Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8 in the AV1611 similar to that which James White raised.

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 268-9</sup> states, in response, citing Dr Ruckman<sup>88 p 255, N.B. not p 225</sup>, “*“The Greek text (any Greek text anywhere) says Iesou (Greek for “Jesus”), and if your “Bible” says “Joshua”, you have an inferior translation produced by inconsistent critics who cared nothing about ANY Greek text in a showdown. God the Holy Spirit wrote “Jesus”... to remind you that when Jesus returns He enters the land of Canaan by the same route Joshua entered, attacking a cursed city (Revelation 17, 18) after a seven year period (Joshua 6:15). His rule will be a military dictatorship (Psalm 110, Revelation 20), as Joshua’s was, and the celestial phenomena of Joshua 10:12 will accompany His Advent (Matthew 24:29, Luke 21:25). Furthermore, the Jews will divide the land (Ezekiel 40-48) and repossess it at this time.*

*“Moral: where scholars find “mistakes” in the King James Bible, the HOLY SPIRIT has often given an ADVANCED REVELATION expressly for the purpose of confounding the “leading authorities who agree.”” Moreover, Joshua 5:13-15 and Exodus 23:21 reveal that “the captain of the Lord’s host” is “the captain of their salvation” Hebrews 2:10, JESUS, to Whom Joshua was subordinate for the entire campaign, Joshua 4:14, 6:27, 7:6-13, 10:25, 42.”*

But White objects further, his emphases, to the AV1611 for having gone “beyond the bounds [what these are and set by whom are unclear]...for the large variety of ways in which it will translate the same word.” Possibly to counter the kind of observation that Will Kinney makes above, namely that the NASV translates one Hebrew word in 20 different ways, White allows for some use of synonyms in translation but he protests that “the Hebrew term for “word” or “thing” is rendered by **eighty-four** different English words in the KJV! Another term, “to turn back,” is rendered ...by **sixty** different English words!”

Again, the same comments from this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 181</sup> apply to White’s objections. Note that ‘our critic’ and James White each refer to “84 English words to render

one Hebrew word,” indicating that the same destructive critic, Genesis 3:1, was their original source.

*“Our critic criticises the AV1611 translators in this sub-section for their use of 84 English words to render one Hebrew word and of 17 English words for one Greek word. WHO was “confused” by this variety and HOW? Moreover, aren’t the champions of ‘the Greek and the Hebrew’ continually reminding the poor, ignorant “KJV-onlyists” about how the ‘feeble English’ [“our less rich English tongue” according to “sir Oracle” James White<sup>3 p vi</sup>] can never attain the ‘depth of meaning’ of the “trusty Greek” and of how words in the AV1611 were repeatedly mistranslated and should have been translated differently? This very section of our critic’s document certainly testifies to this [as does James White’s whole book]. Surely the AV1611 translators would have been RIGHT some of the time, after 84 attempts in one case and 17 in another? Why doesn’t our critic list these instances?”*

Why didn’t White (or ‘our critic’) produce examples to show where the AV1611 had erred in its selection of 84 synonyms for the translation of one Hebrew word, or 60 or 17 in other cases?

Dr Ruckman’s<sup>1 p 289</sup> comments apply, his emphasis.

*“This is the standard way all Roman Catholic historians write: see The History of the New Testament Church, Vol. 2, 1984, Chapter Six. You make a shocking statement which you trust will shake up your reader so badly due to his lack of information that he will side with you without demanding **information**.”*

White protests finally in this respect that *“Those who have attempted to follow the usage of a particular Hebrew or Greek term through the AV know how difficult such a task can be, and the inconsistency of the KJV in translating terms only makes the job that much harder.”*

White has contradicted himself again. He allowed for the use of synonyms in translation at the beginning of the same paragraph, which he concludes with the above statement, now declaring that the aforesaid legitimate use of synonyms is *“inconsistency of the KJV.”* Even if White complains that the AV1611 goes *“beyond the bounds”* [unspecified] with respect to use of synonyms, such use cannot be described as *“inconsistency.”*

Once again, it is White who is being ‘inconsistent.’

He also fails to inform readers of what particular purpose is served by following *“the usage of a particular Hebrew or Greek term through the AV.”*

White produces no evidence to show that such a procedure is in any way more beneficial or even as beneficial, with respect to *“the edifying of the body of Christ”* Ephesians 4:12b than *“comparing spiritual things with spiritual”* 1 Corinthians 2:13b – from a 1611 English Bible.

It is up to James White to demonstrate otherwise.

White’s next objection is with respect to paraphrasing in the AV1611, where he accuses the translators of being *“quite free with their terms”* although bible believers criticise *“the use of “paraphrase” in modern translations.”*

Contrary to White’s<sup>3 p 233</sup> accusations against them of *“self contradiction”* and *“inconsistency,”* bible believers are quite right to criticise *“the use of “paraphrase” in modern translations”* as this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 191-2</sup> shows.

*“Outright additions to the Scripture by the NIV certainly occur in 1 Corinthians 4:9, according to the TBS Quarterly Record, No’s 473, Oct-Dec. 1980 and 501, Oct.-Dec. 1987, which state:*

*“The words “procession” and “arena” (found in the NIV) do not occur here in Paul’s Greek, and it is not certain that Paul is even indirectly referring to these ideas. By exercising their imagination in this way, the NIV translators here overstep the boundary between translating and explaining.” See also Radmacher and Hodges<sup>162</sup>, Chapters 3 and 4, for example with respect to the NIV expression “Dear woman” in John 2:4 and 19:26 and merely “woman” in John 4:21 and 8:10, even though the underlying Greek text is the same in all four verses. Moreover, the NIV has “heart” for “pneuma” in Romans 1:9 although neither Vine nor Young give such a meaning. The word is that for “spirit” as given in the AV1611.”*

But White’s point here is subtle. He doesn’t deny that paraphrasing is found in modern versions but he insists that, *“The KJV is not free from “dynamic” translations,”* i.e. paraphrasing and therefore *“Given the tremendously strong language that has been used by KJV Only advocates against such translations as the NIV for doing that very thing, we see here another example where the KJV itself makes the KJV Only position self-contradictory and inconsistent.”*

The bible believer’s “position” is neither “self-contradictory” nor “inconsistent” if it can be shown that the AV1611 readings about which White complains in this section are valid and that a modern version such as the NIV inserts ““dynamic” translations” that are genuinely invalid. Appropriate comment follows.

White points to Matthew 27:44, where the AV1611 has **“cast the same in his teeth”** instead of “reviled” even though *“there is no word “teeth” in the Greek text”* and 2 Samuel 8:18 where the AV1611 has **“rulers”** instead of “priests” even though *“the term...is actually the specific term for “priests” and is rendered as such at Exodus 19:6.”*

The NKJV has “reviled” in Matthew 27:44, the NASV has *“insulting Him with the same words.”*

Once again, White and ‘our critic’ have united in their attack on the Holy Bible, with respect to Matthew 27:44<sup>8 p 200-203</sup>. References have been updated.

*“Our critic’s last “paraphrase” is in **Matthew 27:44** where “cast the same in his teeth”, AV1611, should be “heaped insults on him” or similar as in the NIV, JB, NWT and the English renderings of the Greek texts.*

*“The AV1611 reading is found in the Concise Oxford Dictionary with the meaning “RE-PROACH”. Our critic is gnat-straining and Dr. Ruckman has an appropriate comment<sup>33 p 227</sup>:*

*“THE BOOK is the real author of all controversies among the Biblical Scholars; all their gimmicks are invented for one purpose only - to get rid of THE BOOK.*

*““Observe! If the AUTHORISED VERSION says “cast the same in his teeth” (Matt. 27:44), it obviously is a very poor translation because it does not CORRESPOND (formally) to “the Greek text.” Alter it. Make it FORMAL.*

*““If the AUTHORISED VERSION says, “by many infallible proofs” (Acts 1:3), it is TOO FORMAL, for the word “tekmerion” (infallible proofs) is found to mean “demonstrative proofs” in Aristotle and “convincing proofs” in Plato. (Lysias says in his “Oration against Erastosthenes” that it is “CERTAIN PROOFS.”)*

““But, this “should be” DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE this time instead of FORMAL CORRESPONDENCE; so every English translation on the market since 1881 DIVESTED JESUS CHRIST OF THE INFALLIBLE PROOFS OF HIS RESURRECTION and gives you “dynamism” instead of “formalism”: i.e., “many proofs.”

““See how it’s done? Do you see WHY it is done?””

Will Kinney<sup>177</sup> comments on Matthew 27:44 as follows. His comments are quite revealing about the repeated editing of modern versions such as the NASV, as Solomon observed, **“her ways are moveable, that thou canst not know them”** Proverbs 5:6b.

“Matthew 27:44 “Cast the same in his teeth”...

“James White has produced a book called *The King James Only Controversy*. It contains a great deal of misinformation, unjust criticism, and outright hypocrisy in his attacks on the King James Bible.

“On page 231 Mr. White discusses paraphrases in the various versions and says: “The KJV is not free from “dynamic” translations. At times the translators were actually quite free with their terms. They translated the rather straightforward term “reviled” as “cast the same in his teeth” at Matthew 27:44 (there is no word “teeth” in the Greek text).” End of quote. Again, Mr. White is not completely accurate. The single word ‘oneidizo’ is translated as “cast in his teeth”; the part about “the same” is actually in the Greek text as separate words in this sentence.

“I do not dispute that there are a few instances when the KJB paraphrases some constructions while retaining the intended meaning of the phrase, but the number of these is much fewer than the other versions. On the whole the KJB gives us a far more literal rendering of the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts than the NKJV, NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV and others. If you want proof of how the NASB (for whom James White presently works) is far less literal in scores of verses, please see my article “The ever-changing ‘literal’ NASB” here: <http://www.geocities.com/brandplucked/whbins.html>

“The exact phrase in Greek found in Matthew 27:44 is different from the one in Mark 15:32 which is translated as “reviled him”. Here in Matthew 27 there are extra words added in all the texts which make it extremely awkward to translate them literally. In fact, none of the versions, including the NKJV, NASB, NIV, take a literal approach but they ALL paraphrase to some extent.

“The Greek here reads: “To d’ auto (kai hoi leestai hoi sustaurothentes autoo) ooneidizon auton” which would be something like “and the same also the thieves the ones were crucified with him reviled him”.

“Here are some of the different ways various versions have rendered this construction. It should be noted that none of them is a strictly literal rendering. All of them are “paraphrases”.

“The NASB keeps on changing from one edition to the next. The changes introduced in the 1995 NASB update where it differs from the 1977 edition affect 10,616 verses and directly affect 24,338 words. There are only 4,704 changes in capitalization, 32 in spelling, and 30 in italics. This makes 19,572 corrections involving word omissions, additions, transpositions, or substitutions to the text of the NASB 1977. There are 6,966 fewer words in the 1995 edition than there were in the 1977 NASB. These are not all just different ways of saying the same thing - the NASB of 1995 has actually altered the text itself, by adding whole phrases which were not found in the 1977 edition. Every example of these changes is documented in a book by Laurence M. Vance titled *Double Jeopardy*,

published in 1998. It can be obtained by calling 850-474-1626 or by going to <http://home.att.net/~vancepub>

*"In the 1977 edition the NASB has: "were casting the same insults at Him", but in the 1995 edition it says: "were also insulting Him with the same words". In both editions, there are words added that are not found in any Greek text. Both editions rearrange the word order; "the same" is not connected with insults in the one, and there is no word for "words" in the 1995 NASB. Mr. White said it should be "reviled" yet neither NASB uses this word.*

*"NIV - "also heaped insults on Him" - omits "the same", which is found in the KJB and in all Greek texts.*

*"NKJV - "reviled Him with the same things" - again there is no "with" or "things" in any text, and the word order is again changed...*

*"The expression "to cast in one's teeth" is not archaic or hard to understand. It effectively communicates the meaning intended here. In Dictionary.Com and in Webster's Dictionary the expression is listed as meaning "to upbraid or abuse one for something".*

*"It should be noted that the KJB does not stand alone in rendering this awkward Greek construction as "cast the same in his teeth". So also do the following Bible versions: The Tyndale New Testament 1534, Miles Coverdale 1535, Matthew's Bible 1551, the Great Bible (Cranmer's bible) 1569, The Bishop's Bible 1577..."*

Kinney cites many lesser-known modern versions that approximate the AV1611 rendering in Matthew 27:44. He follows these citations with numerous examples of extreme paraphrase in the NIV, NASV and concludes as follows.

*"If being literal is generally a good thing to do when possible, then the King James Bible is far, far more literal than the NASB, and especially the NIV. I marvel at so many who go around telling us the NASB is such a "literal translation". It is not. A real eye opener for those who think the NASB is such a great literal translation, may I suggest you read my comparative study of the vaunted NASB called The Ever-Changing "literal" NASB, found here: <http://www.geocities.com/brandplucked/whbins.html>"*

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has *"upbraided Him of the same thing,"* Tyndale<sup>47</sup> and Geneva<sup>49</sup> have *"cast in his teeth"* and the Bishops'<sup>138</sup> has *"cast the same in his teeth"* in agreement with the AV1611. The bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Reformation clearly knew of the dictionary definition. But why doesn't White criticise William Tyndale and the other pre-1611 translators for their wording of Matthew 27:44? Again, he is being 'inconsistent.'

Concerning *"rulers"* versus *"priests,"* White forgot Hebrews 7:14. Use of the term *"priests"* in 2 Samuel 8:18 would be wrong, according to the scripture. Like the Lord Jesus Christ, David and his offspring were from the tribe of Judah, not the priestly tribe of Levi.

**"For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood."**

But if White thinks the AV1611 is wrong in 2 Samuel 8:18 because it uses the word *"rulers,"* why doesn't he level similar criticisms against the NIV, NASV, NKJV, which use the terms *"ministers"* or *"advisors"*?

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> and Coverdale<sup>167</sup> have *"priests"* but Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops'<sup>138</sup> each has *"chief rulers,"* indicating that the AV1611 reading was itself a product of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Eng-



lish Reformation. But White fails to criticise these translations. Again, he is being ‘inconsistent’ and resorting to a ‘double standard.’

White also objects to the AV1611’s use of “*the term “God” in familiar sayings...the British mind is certainly accustomed to the saying, “God save the king,” but the Hebrew mind never thought of such a thing.*” White would therefore prefer “*in such places as 1 Samuel 10:24*” the reading “*“Let the king live” or “Long live the king.”*”

White forgot 2 Kings 6:9, 10.

***“And the man of God sent unto the king of Israel, saying, Beware that thou pass not such a place; for thither the Syrians are come down. And the king of Israel sent to the place which the man of God told him and warned him of, and saved himself there, not once nor twice,”***

And 2 Chronicles 18:31.

***“And it came to pass, when the captains of the chariots saw Jehoshaphat, that they said, It is the king of Israel. Therefore they compassed about him to fight: but Jehoshaphat cried out, and the LORD helped him; and God moved them to depart from him.”***

And Psalm 18:3.

***“I will call upon the LORD, who is worthy to be praised: so shall I be saved from mine enemies.”***

“*The Hebrew mind*” certainly “*thought of such a thing.*” White doesn’t know his bible. But what is of the utmost importance are the thoughts of *God’s* mind and the Lord has clearly always thought of “*God save the king.*”

***“The counsel of the LORD standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations”*** Psalm 33:11. And in the same Psalm,

***“There is no king saved by the multitude of an host...Our soul waiteth for the LORD: he is our help and our shield”*** Psalm 33:16-20.

‘Our critic’ also objected to 1 Samuel 10:24 in the AV1611. See reference above and *Appendix, Table A1*.

*“His first examples are in 1 Samuel 10:24 and 2 Kings 11:12, where “God save the king”, AV1611, should be “Long live the king” or similar as in the NIV, JB, NWT [and in the NASV, NKJV].*

*“Regardless of any complaints about “paraphrasing”, 1 Timothy 2:1-4 IN THE BIBLE, not “the Greek”, shows that the AV1611 is perfectly in order and SUPERIOR TO THE LITERAL HEBREW.”*

***“I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.”***

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has “*live the king*” and “*the king live*” in 1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Kings 11:12, Coverdale<sup>167</sup> has “*God save the new king*” and “*God save the king*” respectively, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> have “*God save the king*” in both verses. The level of agreement with the AV1611 in these verses show that the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Reformation translators knew the scriptures better than James White.

Will Kinney<sup>178</sup> comments as follows on **“God save the king.”**

*““God Save the King”*

*“One of the phrases frequently attacked in the King James Bible is “God save the king”.*

*“A modern version proponent recently wrote our Which Version club with the following criticism.*

*““There is another set of passages in which the King James Version translators used a dynamic equivalence method in which they inserted God’s name where it is not in the original. This is in the phrases “God save the king” and “God save king [king’s name]” in 1 Samuel 10:24; 2 Samue16:16; 1 Kings 1:25, 1 Kings 1:34, 1 Kings 1:39, 2 Kings 11:12; and 2 Chronicles 23:11.”*

*“This person then goes on to say that the King James translation of “God save the king” is “DEPLORABLE” because 1. a literal, word-for-word translation method was not used 2. the translators used colloquialism and idiom 3. they deceive the reader into thinking that these words are in the original 4. they take God’s name in vain.*

*“I am often amazed at the criticisms against the King James Bible that the modern version proponents bring up. They don’t usually discover these things for themselves but copy and paste them from some anti-KJV site, like those of Doug Kutilek or James White.*

*“They profess a great love for God’s words, yet if you ask them where we common Christians can get a copy of the infallible words of God, they soon reveal that the only “infallible bible” they have exists solely in their minds and imaginations. They don’t believe any translation can be the infallible words of God nor do they have any “Hebrew and Greek texts” that completely represent the originals. Their mystical bible is made up of their own personal opinions and preferences, and of course, their “bible” differs from the “bible” the next scholar has dreamed up for himself. Each man becomes his own final authority - “In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” Judges 21:25.*

*“The KJB critic often fails to be aware of the fact that those versions so commonly recommended as being “reliable translations”, like the NASB, NIV, ESV, NKJV, often do the very things they condemn in the KJB.*

*““And Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the LORD hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted, and said, GOD SAVE THE KING.” 1 Samuel 10:24.*

*Not only does the KJB correctly express this as “God save the king” but so also do Miles Coverdale 1535, Matthew’s Bible 1537, the Bishop’s Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible of 1599, the Revised Version of 1881, Webster’s 1833 translation, the Douay version of 1950, the KJV 21st Century Version, the Third Millennium Bible, and Darby’s translation employs the same phrase in 1 Kings 1:25.*

*“Realize that the King James Bible and all these other versions are English translations, written to English speaking persons (the target audience) expressing what this Hebrew phrase means in English. We do not have kings here in America, but those God-fearing nations that had or continue to have kings or queens to this day still say ‘God save the king’ or ‘God save the queen’.*

*“The fact is directly implied and recognized that it is God who gives and preserves the life of the king, as well as everyone else on this planet.*

*“Deuteronomy 32:39 “See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I MAKE ALIVE; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand.”*

*““The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty HATH GIVEN ME LIFE.” Job 33:4.*

*““The LORD killeth, AND MAKETH ALIVE; he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up.” 1 Samuel 2:6.*

*““And now, behold, the LORD HATH KEPT ME ALIVE, as he said, these forty years...” Joshua 14:10.*

*““Behold now, thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast shewed unto me IN SAVING my life” Genesis 19:19.*

*““But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them, but SAVED the men children ALIVE.”*

*“All these verses use the very same Hebrew word used in the expression “God SAVE the king.”*

*“The verb used here is...ghah-yah, and is variously translated as “to live, to be whole, to revive, to recover, to quicken, to give life, to make alive, to keep alive, to restore to life, and to save”.*

*“The King James Bible, as well as the Geneva bible, Revised Version and all the others recognize the theological truth that it is God who saves the king alive or takes his life away, and express this theological truth in the English language.*

*“If you want to get technical, it should be noted that in the modern translations, such as the NKJV, NIV, NASB, which say “LONG live the king”, there is no corresponding word for “long” either. These translations express a merely secular wish for a long life without regard for the fact that it is God who gives, preserves, maintains, and saves alive.*

*“It seems a bit hypocritical to say the KJB is adding the word “God”, even though it is definitely implied in biblical theology, when all the new versions do this very thing themselves.*

*“In the NIV alone, they have added the word “God” 104 times when not strictly found in the Old Testament Hebrew texts, added “God” 117 times to the New Testament and the word “Jesus” 336 times to the New Testament when not found in any Greek text.*

*“Likewise the NASB adds the word God or Lord in Exodus 33:9; 34:10; 1 Samuel 16:7; 2 Kings 19:23; 2 Kings 23:19; 2 Chron. 32:24; Job 21:17, 19; Hosea 1:6, 9; Matthew 15:5; Acts 7:4, 19:26; Romans 11:28, and in Matthew 16:22 has that dreaded “God forbid” when ‘God’ literally is not in the text.*

*“The NKJV also “adds” the word God or Lord to Exodus 33:9; 1 Samuel 3:17; 2 Kings 23:19; 2 Chronicles 3:1; 2 Chron. 18:21; Job 7:4, 15:15, 24:22; Lamentations 3:28; Romans 3:29; Acts 7:5 and in Galatians 6:14 again has that dreaded “God forbid” with no ‘God’ literally in the text...”*

*“In Romans 11:4 the King James Bible reads: “But what saith the answer of God unto him?” The NIV reads, “And what was God’s answer to him?” It is interesting to note that there is no word in ANY Greek text for the word “God”. Despite this fact the NIV reads “God’s answer”.*

*“The last word in the previous phrase is ‘chrematismos’ and it carries the idea of 1) an answer from God or 2) a divine response or revelation. To communicate the meaning of the Greek in this sentence the word “God” or “Divine” must be “added” (even though NOTHING has been added) to the English text. In fact, if “God” were not ‘added’ then the sense of the verse would be lost.*

*“Another example is found in Matthew 2:22, using the same word as in Romans 11:4. The KJB reads, “And being WARNED OF GOD in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way.”*

*“Here the NASV reads, “And having been warned by God...”; the NKJV reads, “And being warned by God...” Once again we see that the NASV, NKJV have committed the unpardonable sin, according to Bible critic, of stating “by God” when God is not in the Greek text.*

*“The NASB, using this same Greek word, “adds” the word God or Divine in Matthew 2:12, 22; Acts 10:22; Romans 11:4; and in Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7....*

*“The NKJV also does this in Matthew 2:12, 22; Acts 10:22; Romans 11:4; Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7. These modern versions at other times render the same word as “called, warned, or revealed”, and leave out the part about God. Sometimes the idea of God is implied in certain contexts and at other times it is not; this is how biblical languages work.*

*“Likewise in Mark 7:11 we read in all texts: “But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, A GIFT (dooron), by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free.”*

*“However instead of the simple word “gift”, the NASB, NIV, ESV all add the word GOD to the text by saying: “given TO GOD”, while the NKJV paraphrases and adds these words: “dedicated TO THE TEMPLE”, none of which are found in any Greek text.*

*“The clear facts are that both the Hebrew and the Greek texts allow for ‘God’ to be implicitly stated in many expressions, even though strictly speaking, the literal word for God is not there in the text. There is nothing wrong, incorrect or deplorable in the Bishop’s Bible, Coverdale, the Geneva Bible, the KJB, the Revised Version, Webster’s, Douay, Darby, or the Third Millennium Bible by translating the phrase as “God save the king.” Those who claim it is wrong merely show their ignorance of how languages work when translated from one into another.”*

White nevertheless adds *“The same free rendering is found in 1 Corinthians 16:2 [**“as God hath prospered him”**], where...the term “God” is nowhere to be found (as the italics in the KJV indicate).”*

So what is the problem? However, once again, White neglected the scriptures, which show that the italicised insertion is entirely correct.

***“But thou shalt remember the LORD thy God: for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth, that he may establish his covenant which he sware unto thy fathers, as it is this day”*** Deuteronomy 8:18.

***“And he sought God in the days of Zechariah, who had understanding in the visions of God: and as long as he sought the LORD, God made him to prosper”*** 2 Chronicles 16:5.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 6</sup> adds, her emphases, *“If White had done a six year long word-for-word collation instead of a six week long slap-dash high school newspaper style analysis,*

he would often avoid faulting the KJV. For example, in I Cor. 16:2 the KJV inserts the word “God” to **identify** “him.” How can he fault the KJV for this when a word-for-word collation of the NIV proves they substitute names (i.e. Jesus) for pronouns (i.e. he) and vice versa, **hundreds** and **hundreds** of times. Greek or Hebrew names and pronouns are interchanged indiscriminately **all over** the NIV.”

The King’s men<sup>8 p 29-30, 203-205</sup> inserted italicised words where necessary, although several editions of the AV1611 were published before complete consistency was achieved. However, their scholarly approach is in complete contrast to the slipshod insertions into the NIV that Dr Mrs Riplinger describes and of which White failed to inform his readers.

But White continues with, supposedly, “a more serious example.” He objects to the Holy Bible’s use of the expression “**God forbid**” in Romans 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11 etc. because “*The Greek text nowhere has the word “God” in any of these passages*” and therefore ““*God forbid*”...*is hardly an accurate translation of the Greek phrase*” (no doubt an ‘error’ that escaped the notice of Professor William Dakins<sup>12 p 15-16, 25 Appendix 1</sup>, Greek Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge and member of the Westminster Committee that translated Romans for the AV1611 and his six fellow committee members of equivalent scholastic standing – if only they’d had James White to help them!) which instead should be translated “*may it never be*” or “*by no means!*”

Will Kinney<sup>179</sup> has an informative article on the expression “**God forbid.**” He addresses the attack on the expression by arch-bible critic, Doug Kutilek, James White’s fellow traveller in opposing the Holy Bible.

““**GOD FORBID!**”

“*Doug Kutilek is a virulent critic of the King James Bible. He has written this short article criticizing the rendering of “God forbid” as is found in the Holy Bible. Here is his opinion and then I will post the refutation.*

“*Doug Kutilek writes: “The phrase “God forbid” occurs some 24 times in the King James Version of the Bible. Nine of these occurrences are in the OT (and thrice the similar “the LORD forbid”), while fifteen are found in the NT. Of the NT occurrences, all but one are found in the writings of Paul.*

““*As has been pointed out countless times with regard to the use of the phrase “God forbid” to render the words of the original Hebrew and Greek, it is a close English equivalent except for two facts: 1. the word “God” is not found in the original text; and 2. neither is the word “forbid.” Other than that, it is a fine representation of the original!*

““*It is obvious, of course, that here at least, the KJV is not a literal translation of the original, but is at best a paraphrase, a “dynamic equivalent.” (Do I hear some rigid KJV adherent mutter under his breath, “God forbid!”?)*

““*The NT passages, gleaned from Strong’s concordance, are Luke 20:16; Romans 3:4; 3:6; 3:31; 6:2; 6:15; 7:7; 7:13; 9:14; 11:1; 11:11; I Corinthians 6:15; Galatians 2:17; 3:21; 6:14. In every case but the last, the phrase is a self-standing grammatical unit, expressing strong opposition or rejection of a just mentioned opinion, point of view, or implied answer to a question. In Galatians 6:14, it is incorporated into a sentence.*

““*In all 15 references, the Greek phrase is identical: ME GENOITO. ME is a negative particle usually used with verbs in the subjunctive, optative or imperative moods. GENOITO is a rare NT occurrence of a verb in the optative mood (just 56 cases in all). It is from the verb GINOMAI, “to be, become, happen,” etc. Taken together, the phrase*

may be literally rendered, “may it not be,” a phrase weaker in force in English than the Greek original.

““Modern English equivalents would be “not at all!” or “absolutely not!” or “certainly not!” or “by no means” or “under no circumstances” or “perish the thought!” or even the colloquial, “no way, Jose!” (see the New King James Bible, New American Standard Bible, and New International Version in the passages involved).

““While all of these modern renderings are other than strictly literal renderings of ME GENOITO, they at least have the advantage over the KJV rendering of not introducing the name of God where it is not found in the original.

““Frankly, I am at a loss to explain how it came to pass that “God forbid,” came to be considered by Wycliffe and other early English translators from Tyndale to the KJV as a suitable and correct translation of the Greek ME GENOITO. It was strictly a phenomenon that arose in the then-very small English-speaking world, as far as I can tell. It cannot be defended as “the closest possible English equivalent.” The renderings of the NKJB, NASB, and NIV are very much to be preferred to it.

“ - Doug Kutilek “AS I SEE IT” Volume 4, Number 4, April, 2001

“And now for my rebuttal.

“All previous English versions use this same expression, God forbid, including Wycliffe 1395; Tyndale 1525; Coverdale 1535; Bishop’s Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599...

“Mr Kutilek apparently is totally unaware that the NASB has ‘God forbid’ in Mat. 16:22 where his own scholarly standards would condemn this version he recommends. It is a different Greek construction, but again neither the words “God” nor “forbid” are found there. Both the NASB and the NIV frequently add the words God or Lord when they are not “in the original text”.

“Surprise! Even the New KJV, which he told us to consult, has rendered the exact same “me genoito” as God forbid in Galatians 6:14!

“In fact this is the definition that the Oxford Greek Dictionary gives. Also Constantine Tsirpanlis, former Instructor in Modern Greek Language and Literature at New York University, Former Consultant for the Program in Modern Greek Studies at Hunter College, Professor of Church History and Greek Studies at Unification Theological Seminary, gives the definition of “me genoito” on page 72 of his book, “Modern Greek Idiom And Phrase Book,” Barron’s Educational Services, Inc., 1978, ISBN 0-8120-0476-0. The ONLY definition Tsirpanlis (a native Greek) gives for “me genoito” is “God forbid!” There is NO reference to “may it never be”, “by no means” or “certainly not”!

“The proper force of this Greek phrase ‘me genoito’ is to express a negative in the strongest of possible terms. The English equivalent of “God forbid” perfectly and accurately expresses this thought, whereas such phrases as “may it not be” come across as anaemic if not effeminate.

“Mr. Kutilek chides our AV because “God” is not literally found in the text. In spite of all his learning he has little understanding of how languages work and exalts his opinion above any bible version out there today.

“Another example using the verb kreematizo and the noun kreematismos is found in Romans 11:4 “But what saith the answer of God unto him?”. The NIV reads, “And what was God’s answer to him?” It is interesting to note that there is no word in ANY Greek

text for the word “God”. Despite this fact the NIV reads “God’s answer”. Now I wonder what Mr. Kutilek would say to that?

“Literally the Greek of Rom. 11:4 reads, “*alla ti legei autoo ho kreematismos*”. The last word in the previous phrase is ‘kreematismos’ and it carries the idea of 1) an answer from God or 2) a divine response or revelation. So, in order to accurately preserve the Greek in this sentence the word “God” or “Divine” must be “added” (even though NOTHING has been added) to the English text. In fact if “God” were not ‘added’ then the sense of the verse would be lost.

“The verb form is found in Matthew 2:12, 22; Acts 10:22; and Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7. In Matthew 2:12 and 22 the KJB reads, “And being warned of God”. The NASB likewise reads in both, “And having been warned by God”, and so does the NKJV in 2:22. The NASB also renders this verb as “warned by God” twice in Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7. The NKJV reads “divinely instructed”, though strictly speaking the words God or Divinely are not “literally” there. Once again we see that the NASB, NKJV and NIV have committed the unpardonable sin, according to Mr. Kutilek, of saying “by God” when God is not in the Greek text.

“The brand new 2001 English Standard Version also “adds” the word God in the expressions “warned of God”, “God’s reply”, and “instructed by God” in Romans 11:4; Hebrews 8:5 and Hebrews 11:7. It also adds the word God to other passages when not literally found in the Greek.

“Another example of “God not being in the text” is found in the NASB three times in Acts 13:43; and Acts 17:4 and 17. In Acts 13:43 the KJB, as well as the NKJV, RV, ASV, and even the NIV read: “many of the Jews and RELIGIOUS (or devout) proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas”. The word is *sebomai* and there is nothing literally found about God in the word at all. Even the NASB in this same chapter verse 50 the word is simply translated as “devout.” However in Acts 13:43, 17:4 and 17 the NASB reads “GOD-fearing”, with no literal “God” in any Greek text. The NIV too switches gears and in both Acts 17:4 and 17 likewise “adds” the word God just like the NASB, but not so the KJB, NKJV, RV or ASV.

“The NASB often adds the words Jesus, God and Lord to their translation, when these words are not found in the Hebrew and Greek texts. The NASB adds the word Jesus in Mark 1:45; Luke 22:63; and Acts 3:16; Acts 9:22. It also adds the word God in 1 Samuel 16:7; Isaiah 37:20 (from Dead Sea Scrolls, but not from Hebrew Masoretic text); Matthew 15:5, 16:22; Acts 3:19, Acts 7:4, Acts 13:43, Acts 19:26; Romans 11:28; 1 Peter 2:9; and Lord in Exodus 33:9, Exodus 34:10; 2 Kings 23:19; Job 20:23, Job 21:17, 19; 2 Chronicles 32:24; Hosea 1:6, 9; and 10:2.

“Acts 7:4 is a bit interesting in that all Greek texts read as the King James Bible has it with: “...when his father was dead, HE removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell.” The 1963 and 1972 NASBs put GOD in the text with no italics, but in 1977 and again in 1995 they placed it in italics. The online NASB still has it not in italics. Likewise the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, Holman and NET versions place the word GOD in the text (with no italics), when in fact it is not there. The point being, it is highly hypocritical of the modern versionists to criticize the King James Bible for doing something that they themselves do as much or more than that great old Book.

“Likewise in Mark 7:11 we read in all texts: “But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, A GIFT (dooron), by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free.”

*“However instead of the simple word “gift”, the NASB, NIV, ESV all add the word GOD to the text by saying: “given TO GOD”, while the NKJV paraphrases and adds these words: “dedicated TO THE TEMPLE”, none of which are found in any Greek text.*

*“The NIV likewise mistranslates the word hagios, which means saints, as “God’s people” a total of ten times in the New Testament. Neither the words God nor people are there in any text*

*“The NIV continually adds to and takes away from the true words of God in both the Old and New testaments. There are certain expressions where the word God or Lord are implied, as in ‘God forbid’ or ‘God save the king’, and in these cases the KJB as well as many other translations express this. However in the NIV what we often find is the word “God” or “Lord” being left out of these expressions and instead, the NIV adds the words God, Lord, Jesus or Christ when it is not in any text, be it Hebrew or Greek.*

*“You might want to take a look at the NIV complete concordance for yourself. In it you will find by their own documentation that the NIV has added the name of Jesus to the New Testament a total of 336 times when it is not found in the Greek texts they themselves are using. That’s three hundred and thirty six times!*

*“The NIV has omitted the name of God or JEHOVAH...thirty eight times (38 not translated) and 52 times they have added LORD, or GOD when it is not in the Hebrew text.*

*“The word Elohim, or God found on page 454 of the NIV concordance, has not been translated 13 times when found in the Hebrew text and it was placed in the NIV text another 52 times when not in the Hebrew for a total of the word “God” being added 104 times and not translated when it is in the text 51 times, and all this just in the Old Testament.*

*“The NIV has also ADDED the word God 117 times in the New Testament when it does not occur in any Greek text nor when it expresses the idea of “God forbid” and they have not translated it three times when it is in their Greek texts.*

*“Likewise the NIV has added the word Christ 15 times when not in any Greek text. See for example Colossians 1:22; 2:9, 10 and 13. The NIV has also added the word Lord to the New Testament 6 times when it is not found in any Greek text - for example: 1 Cor. 1:2; and 7:34. All this factual information is found by merely looking at their own NIV complete concordance...*

*“Mr. Kutilek, and fellow Bible critics are like those described in I Timothy 1:7 “Desiring to be teachers...understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.”*

*“By the rigid standard he sets up, he himself condemns all bible versions in print. He criticizes the KJB for translating me genoito as God forbid, yet the lexicons, including Thayer, Liddel & Scott, and Baer, Arndt & Gingrich all tell us this is a perfectly acceptable way of rendering this expression. There are a whole host of Bible versions both before and after the King James Bible that do the very same thing, including some that Mr. Kutilek himself recommends!*

*“Words of advice from Proverbs for those who think Mr. Kutilek has a handle on the truth. “Go from the presence of a foolish man, when thou perceivest not in him the lips of knowledge.” Proverbs 14:7.”*

*White complains further about the expression “**God forbid**” that, his emphasis, “if a modern translation used a similar phrase, the KJV Only advocates would jump on such a use **immediately**...”*



But the modern translations *don't* use any “*similar phrase*” and their alternatives for “**God forbid**” are inferior, as will be shown. White<sup>3 p 241</sup> can furnish no examples to substantiate his complaint except Romans 8:26, in a note as follows.

*“We note another inconsistency in the AV Only position. The KJV refers to the Holy Spirit with the neuter pronoun “it” in such places as Romans 8:26. While this is a technically correct rendering (the term “spirit” in Greek is neuter), modern translations use “him,” recognizing the personality of the Holy Spirit...one wonders about the double standard that is utilized by KJV Only advocates in attacking modern versions on similar grounds”* i.e. for using a ‘literal’ translation in the 10 verses from Romans that White lists above (Romans 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11) instead of the AV1611’s idiomatic expression “**God forbid.**”

Again, it is White who is using a “*double standard.*” He charges the AV1611 with error when it uses a ‘literal’ translation, as in Romans 8:26 and when it does not, as in Romans 3:4. White’s preoccupation is to find errors in the Holy Bible, “**by any means**” 2 Corinthians 11:3a.

The equivalent criticisms of the modern versions are, however, valid and do not give rise to a “*double standard,*” as will be seen.

White has subtly countered justification of the AV1611 reading based on “*a technically correct rendering*” but this is only part of the explanation of why the King’s men rightly used the neuter pronoun.

The AV1611 sometimes refers to the Holy Spirit as “*it*” or “*itself*” because the Lord Jesus Christ likened the ministry of the Spirit to a neuter force, the wind.

***“The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is everyone that is born of the Spirit”*** John 3:8.

Romans 8:16, 26, 1 Peter 1:11 all describe the ministry of the Holy Spirit within the believer. In these verses, the Spirit bears witness to the adoption of the believer by the Father, supports the intercession for the believer by the Lord Jesus Christ, Hebrews 7:25 and testifies to the sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ on behalf of the believer. Use of the neuter gender in these verses simply ensures that the emphasis is on the other Persons of the Godhead, the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, according to what the Lord Jesus Christ Himself said:

***“Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you the things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you”*** John 16:13, 14.

The Spirit glorifies the Father and the Son in Romans 8:16, 26 and 1 Peter 1:11 and therefore “**he shall not speak of himself.**” See also this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 311</sup>.

*“Our critic then objects to “the Spirit itself” AV1611, in Romans 8:16, 26, claiming the reading should be “himself,” DR, RV, NIV, JB. The NWT and Berry’s TR have “itself,” Ne has both readings.*

*“There are some manifestations of the Spirit of God, Ezekiel 1:20, 21, Revelation 4:5, where application of gender to “Spirit” would not be appropriate. The modern alteration obscures this revelation.”*

The pre-1611 bibles avoid use of the neuter pronoun altogether, except the Geneva<sup>49</sup>, which has *“itself”* in agreement with the AV1611 but White fails to criticise this pre-1611 English Reformation bible.

Will Kinney<sup>180</sup> has an informative article on Romans 8:16 and the term *“itself.”* He is responding again to criticisms expressed by Doug Kutilek, the crony of White’s<sup>3 p 121</sup>. See remarks above and in **Chapter 4**. Will Kinney’s article applies equally to James White’s criticisms of the Holy Bible in Romans 8:26.

*“The Spirit ITSELF beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.”*

*“Is referring to the third person of the of the blessed Trinity, as “itself” a major error in the King James Bible, which borders on blasphemy?”*

*“Doug Kutilek is a well known critic of the KJB. He has both printed, and posted an article on the internet, which harshly criticizes this “supposed” error in the King James Bible.*

*“Mr. Kutilek states: “Any honest evaluation of the King James Version leads to the conclusion that it has numerous defects as a translation, some major, most minor. But of these defects, among the most serious, quite probably the worst of the lot, is its occasional use of the English pronoun “it” to refer to the Holy Spirit.”*

*“He continues, “I will plainly state my opinion on the matter: I think that here the KJV comes dangerously close to blasphemy, if it does not in fact actually wander into it.” He closes his article with these words. “Those who imagine that the KJV...is faultless and error-free are compelled to address the matter.”*

*“The purpose of this article is to “address the matter”. I believe Mr. Kutilek’s objections to the use of “it” or “itself” in referring to the Holy Ghost are both hypocritical and ignorant. Hypocritical because there are many versions, including the modern ones, that use “itself” in either the very same verses or in the very same manner; and ignorant because he doesn’t know the English language very well.*

*“First, see how the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary of 1999 defines the use of the words “it” and “itself”. The second definition given for “itself” is: “used to represent a PERSON or animal understood, previously mentioned, about to be mentioned, or present in the immediate context - Who is it? It is John...Did you see the baby? Yes, isn’t it cute...the cat likes to sun itself in the window.”*

*“The Webster’s 1967 Collegiate Dictionary defines “it”, as “a PERSON or animal whose gender is unknown or disregarded.” The Father and the Son are clearly masculine, but the Spirit is sometimes referred to as masculine and sometimes as neuter, not because He is neuter, but rather because the gender is disregarded or not taken into account in that particular context.*

*“The four verses in the KJB that Mr. Kutilek criticizes are: John 1:32, Romans 8:16, Romans 8:26, and I Peter 1:11. We will examine these verses with other translations and then look at some examples in the new versions.*

*“The first verse is John 1:32. “And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending like a dove, and IT abode upon him.” Other Bible versions that agree with the KJB in their use of “it” are Tyndale’s, the Geneva Bible of 1599 and 1602, Bishops Bible,...American Standard Version of 1901...the Revised Standard Version, the NRSV of 1989, and the 2001 English Standard Version.*

*“The second verse is Romans 8:16. “The Spirit ITSELF beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.” Versions that agree with the KJB are the 21st Century KJB, Alford’s, Bishop’s, Darby, Webster’s,...Goodspeed 1943, Third Millennium, and the NRSV.*

*“The third verse is Romans 8:26. “But the Spirit ITSELF maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.” Again the 21st Century KJB, Alford’s, Bishop’s Bible 1568...Coverdale 1535, Darby, Webster’s 1833...Goodspeed 1943, the Third Millennium Bible, and the Geneva of 1599 and 1602 agree with the KJB.*

*“The fourth verse is 1 Peter 1:11. “Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when IT testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.” Versions that agree with the use of “it” here are...Revised Version of 1881, ASV of 1901, Webster’s, Berkeley...and the NRSV of 1989.*

*“So we see that many Bible versions which both predate and follow the KJB have used “it” and “itself” to refer to the Spirit of God. This is perfectly acceptable English.*

*“The NASB and NIV have two interesting and parallel verses in the New Testament. Both Matthew 12:45 and Luke 11:26 speak of a “spirit that takes along with IT seven other spirits more wicked than ITSELF”.*

*“Here is a case of a spiritual entity that can see, hear, speak, and has a personality, yet the gender is disregarded in the NAS and NIV, and is referred to as “itself”. This spirit was not an inanimate object, but rather a spiritual being with a distinct personality.*

*“In Luke 8:29, the same thing occurs in the KJB, NKJV, NIV, and NASB. “For he had commanded the unclean SPIRIT to come out of the man. For oftentimes IT had caught him.” Here again is a spirit that talks, reasons, hears, and knows that Jesus is the Son of God and that torment awaits him. This is clearly a personality and yet all the above mentioned versions refer to him as an “it”. The gender is disregarded, and this is perfectly acceptable English.*

*“Another instance of the Lord Jesus Christ using the little word “IT” to refer to himself is found in the NASB, NIV, and NKJV in Luke 24:39 where He says: “Behold my hands and my feet, that IT is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.”*

*“Again in Revelation 12:4, a multitude of Bible versions, including the NKJV, NIV, and the brand new English Standard Version of 2001, all refer to the child Jesus as IT. “And the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as IT was born.”*

*“All of the modern versions use “itself” when referring to both animals and groups of people. The NKJV has the donkey itself in Hosea 8:9, the goat itself in Lev. 16:22; Israel itself in Judges 7:2. Numbers 23:9 speaks of “a people dwelling alone, not reckoning itself among the nations”, and Zechariah 12:12, “the family of the house of David by itself.”*

*“All Bible versions at times speak of Jesus Christ as being a thing or something neuter. In Matthew 1:20, the angel of the Lord says to Joseph: “fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for THAT WHICH is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.”*

*“Notice the angel does not say “he”, but “that which”: it is neuter both in Greek and in English. In Luke 1:35, the angel says to Mary, “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also THAT HOLY THING*

*which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” That holy thing is neuter, yet we all know that Jesus Christ is a person, in fact, God manifest in the flesh.*

*“The book of 1 John opens with a reference to Jesus Christ, yet it refers to Him as a thing. “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life.” Yet Christ is not a thing, but a person. In 1 John 5:4 we are told: “WHATSOEVER is born of God overcometh the world.” This is a neuter. Are we to assume that everyone who is born of God is a thing?*

*“Mr. Kutilek’s objections to these four verses in the KJB seem to be unfounded [along with White’s]. God’s ways are not our ways, and His thoughts are not our thoughts. He has revealed Himself to us in His inspired words, and I believe He has faithfully kept them for us today in the English language of the King James Bible.”*

However, White is even prepared to sacrifice one of his preferred translations, the NIV, on the altar of subversion of the Holy Bible, with respect to the AV1611’s use of **“three years”** in Amos 4:4 – see also remarks in **Chapter 3**. White points out that both the AV1611 and NIV translate *“the Hebrew phrase “three days” as “three years”* and allows that *“it may well be possible that both the KJV and NIV are correct.”* But he still finds fault with bible believers because *“both [translations] are engaging in a certain amount of “interpretation” at this point”* and *“Given the tremendously strong language...used by KJV Only advocates against such translations as the NIV for doing that very same thing, we see here another example where the KJV itself makes the KJV Only position self-contradictory and inconsistent.”*

Again, it is James White’s objection to the Holy Bible that is *“self-contradictory and inconsistent.”* He has forgotten the biblical precedent for one day made equivalent to a year.

***“After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years, and ye shall know my breach of promise”*** Numbers 14:34.

***“Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy”*** Daniel 9:24.

White also neglects to mention that his preferred NASV agrees with the DR, JR, JB, NWT in using *“three days”* or the equivalent in Amos 4:4, which reading cannot be correct, as White himself grudgingly admits above. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> and Coverdale<sup>167</sup> each have *“the third day”* but Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> each read **“three years”** in agreement with the AV1611, indicating that God introduced this correction during the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Reformation, before the King James translators began their work.

So White is not well informed about church history. He also forgot Deuteronomy 14:28, 26:12 – citing these verses, Dr Ruckman<sup>40 p 265</sup> notes that the reading *“third day”* is *“an ancient corruption...found in the Alexandrian Septuagint.”* This corruption<sup>41</sup> could therefore have influenced Wycliffe and Coverdale but as indicated, it was corrected by the later pre-1611 bibles.

***“At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates”*** Deuteronomy 14:28.

***“When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled”*** Deuteronomy 26:12.

Did White not notice the marginal note for Amos 4:4 in the AV1611, “*three years of days,*” which no doubt sets out the literal reading, which the King’s men then rendered correctly according to good style? It was James White<sup>3 p 77</sup> who insisted that, “*The importance of the marginal notes to the KJV Only controversy should not be overlooked.*” So why did White overlook the marginal note for Amos 4:4? See remarks in **Chapter 4**.

Will Kinney<sup>181</sup> has these comments on James White’s assessment of Amos 4:4 in the AV1611.

*“Amos 4:4 After Three Years or Three Days?”*

*“I have read James White’s book, The King James Only Controversy, three or four times and have found many inconsistencies, lies and hypocrisy on his part.*

*“Regarding Amos 4:4 Mr. White writes on page 232: “At times the KJV attempts to get around difficulties, so to speak. For example, at Amos 4:4 the KJV renders the Hebrew phrase “three days” as “three years”, ostensibly so that the passage would remain in accordance with Jewish law, which required the gathering of certain of the tithes each three years. Interestingly enough, the NIV also chose to translate the “three days” as “three years”, probably for the same reason. While it may be possible that both the KJV and the NIV are correct in their understanding of this passage, the point should be made that neither is strictly translating the text. Both are engaging in a certain amount of interpretation at this point. Given the tremendously strong language that has been used by KJV Only advocates against such translations as the NIV for doing that very thing, we see here another example where the KJV itself makes the KJV Only position self-contradictory and inconsistent.”*

*“Mr. White now works for the NASB committee, so his bias is towards this particular version. However, let’s look at the provable facts.*

*“First of all not only does the KJB say “bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes after THREE YEARS” but so do the NIV, as pointed out by Mr. White, and the Spanish Reina Valera of 1579 and 1909, the Bishop’s Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599... The NKJV and the NASB say every three DAYS instead of three “years”.*

*“Now it is interesting that a man who works for the NASB translation committee, as Mr. James White does, would accuse the KJB of not being as literal as the NASB. The KJB does give the correct meaning of every three years because this corresponds to what is clearly taught in Deuteronomy 14:28 “At the end of three YEARS thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates”.*

*“When we look up what the Hebrew word is we find that it is yohm. This word is usually translated as “day”, but not by any means is it always so translated. We find that the KJB has translated this word 15 times as “year”. Now if the NASB is more literal than the KJB, why then did the NASB translators themselves render this same Hebrew word yohm as “years” not just 15 times as the KJB, but 29 times as “years” or “yearly” - almost twice as often? The NIV likewise has it as “years” some 25 times and 65 times they have not translated it at all.*

*“Some examples of where the NASB and KJB have yohm as years are Exodus 13:10 when speaking of the yearly Passover: “Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season from YEAR TO YEAR.” (yohm to yohm)*

*“In Numbers 9:22 the children of Israel journeyed when the cloud was taken up “whether it were two days (yohm) or a month, or a year” (yohm).*

*“In 1 Samuel 2:19 speaking of Samuel: “Moreover his mother made him a little coat, and brought it to him from YEAR TO YEAR” (yohm to yohm); see also 1:3, 21; 20:6; and 2 Samuel 14:26 speaking of Absalom: “And when he polled his head, (for it was at every YEAR’S end that he polled it) he weighed the hair of his head...” and in 2 Chronicles 21:19 speaking of the wicked king Jehoram whom the LORD smote in his bowels with an incurable disease: “And it came to pass, that in process of time, after the end of two YEARS, his bowels fell out by reason of his sickness”.*

*“Not only has the “more literal” NASB translated the word yohm as years almost twice as often as the KJB, but it also has “literally” translated this same Hebrew word as: “afternoon, age, always, battle, birthday, Chronicles, continually, course of time, daylight, each, entire, eternity, evening, ever, fate, first, forever, full, life, long, now, older, once, period, perpetually, present, recently, reigns, ripe age, short-lived, so long, some time, survived, time, usual, very old, when, while, whole and yesterday.” How is that for being more literal than the KJB?!*

*“In the New Testament the NASB has also three times rendered the Greek word hemera, or day, as YEAR. See Luke 1:7,18 and 2:36.*

*“Those King James Bible critics who mention how the NASB is more literal than the KJB, would be wise to refrain from mentioning the good Doctor White’s example of Amos 4:4 as being an instance of such “getting around the difficulties, so to speak”.*

Yet again, therefore, White is being ‘inconsistent’ and using a ‘double standard.’ The “*strong language*” that bible believers use against the modern versions is aimed at interpretative readings that are *wrong*. See, for example, remarks in **Chapter 8** on the NIV’s incorrect translation of Micah 5:2 and Dr Barker’s attempts, approved by James White, to defend the indefensible.

Like most bible critics, White<sup>3 p 233-4, 241</sup> cannot resist attacking Acts 12:4, where according to White, “**Easter**” in the AV1611 should be “*Passover*” as in the NIV, NASV, NKJV – and the DR, JR, JB, NWT. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

White insists that “*The days of unleavened bread...were connected with the Passover celebration...Luke’s reference to the days of “unleavened bread” makes it clear that he is referring to the Jewish holiday season, not to some pagan festival that did not become known by the specific term “Easter” for some time to come.*”

White then takes issue, his emphases, with Dr Sam Gipp’s<sup>31 p 3ff</sup> explanation for the term “**Easter**” in the AV1611.

*“The argument is that the “days of unleavened bread” extend from the fifteenth to the twenty-first of the month, while Passover itself was the fourteenth. Hence, according to this line of reasoning, the Passover was already past, and hence Herod, a pagan, was referring to “Easter” in its pagan celebration, not the Passover. The problem, of course, is that (1) the term Easter would **still** be a misleading translation, since the celebration the English reader thinks of is far removed from the pagan worship of Astarte; (2) Herod Agrippa, according to the Jewish historian Josephus, was a conspicuous observer of the Jewish customs and rituals, and since he was attempting to please the Jews (Acts 12:3), it*

is obvious that Luke is referring to the **Jewish** Passover, not a pagan celebration; (3) the argument depends upon making the “days of unleavened bread” a completely separate period of time from “the Passover.” Unfortunately for the KJV Only position, the term “the Passover” is used of the entire celebration, including the days of unleavened bread after the actual sacrifice of the Passover, in other places in Scripture (note the wrapping up of the entire celebration under the term the “feast of the Jews” in John 2:13; 2:23; 6:4 and 11:55). Therefore, this ingenious attempt at saving the KJV from a simple mistake fails under examination.”

Note first that White has contradicted himself again. It suits his attack on Acts 12:4 to state that, “the celebration the English reader thinks of is far removed from the pagan worship of Astarte.” But the thinking of many English readers was clearly at odds with White’s attack on the AV1611 expression “**God save the king**” 1 Samuel 10:24, see above. White states categorically, “the British mind is certainly accustomed to the saying, “God save the king,” but the Hebrew mind never thought of such a thing.” White is therefore again being ‘inconsistent’ and resorting to a ‘double standard.’

When Dr Gipp’s explanation is examined, it is clear that White has bypassed its essential points.

*“The days of unleavened bread are NEVER referred to as the Passover. (It must be remembered that the angel of the Lord passed over Egypt on **one** night, **not** seven nights in a row...)*

*“Verse 3 shows that Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (April 15-21). The Bible says: “**Then** were the days of unleavened bread.” The Passover (April 14<sup>th</sup>) had **already come and gone**. Herod could not possibly have been referring to the Passover in his statement concerning Easter. The next Passover was a **year away!**”*

White’s objection to Dr Gipp’s explanation rests upon the notion that “the term “the Passover” is used of the entire celebration,” which it does not, as Dr Holland<sup>164</sup> affirms in his response to White’s objections above. Dr Holland<sup>55 p 183-6</sup> has also provided an extensive discussion of “**Easter**” elsewhere.

*“None of this deals with the fact that in Scripture Passover came before the Days of Unleavened Bread. In Mark 14:1 we read, “After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread.” Passover\* precedes the Days of Unleavened Bread even in the New Testament. None of the verses cited by White change this. In fact, three of them simply state that Passover was near (John 2:13; 6:4 and 11:55). John 2:23 speaks of many making a surface pretense of believing in Christ at the feast of the Passover. None of these verses show the two events as being called “Passover” as White states. As for Herod observing the Jewish feasts, this means little\*\* because as a politician he obeyed whatever was [convenient] for him while in political power, including both Jewish and Roman holidays. And, it should be remembered, that this “conspicuous observer of the Jewish customs and rituals” had just put James to death and was himself about to die by the hand of God for setting himself up as a god (Acts 12:21-23; Exodus 20:2-6).”*

\*As Nisan 14<sup>th</sup>. See remarks below. \*\*Confirmed below.

As Dr Holland indicates, James White’s allusions to John 2:13, 23, 6:4 and 11:55 with reference to “the term “the feast of the Jews”” are misleading. The term only occurs once, in John 6:4, as “**a feast of the Jews.**” But John 2:23 refers to “**the passover, in the feast day,**” which is clearly contrary to White’s supposition that “the term “the Passover” is used of the entire celebration.”

Only in the millennial reign of the Lord Jesus Christ do the Jews hold a passover feast that lasts seven days.

***“In the first month, in the fourteenth day of the month, ye shall have the passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten”*** Ezekiel 45:21.

White uses a non-biblical source, Josephus, to justify attacking the word “*Easter*” in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible because “*Herod Agrippa...was a conspicuous observer of Jewish customs and rituals.*” The scripture does not consider this detail to be of any significance in its record of Herod’s actions in Acts 12:1-4, which included the murder of the Apostle James, which in turn “*pleased the Jews*” Acts 12:2. However, if a Gentile king’s acquaintance with “*Jewish customs and rituals*” is of significance, the scripture faithfully records it. Witness Paul’s defence before Agrippa.

***“Especially because I know thee to be expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews: wherefore I beseech thee to hear me patiently”*** Acts 26:3.

The bible believer may therefore ignore any observance on the part of Herod Agrippa with respect to “*Jewish customs and rituals*” for the simple reason that the bible does - in any translation.

Returning to Acts 12:3-5, as Dr. Gipp indicates, the key sentence is “*Then were the days of unleavened bread.*” This must have been after Nisan 14<sup>th</sup>, which has a special designation in scripture as “*the first day of the feast of unleavened bread*” Matthew 26:17, which feast overlaps with the Passover – see text and Exodus 12:15, 18.

***“Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses: for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel.”***

***“In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even.”***

These references explain Luke 22:1.

***“Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover.”***

The putting away of unleavened coincided with the Passover of Nisan 14<sup>th</sup> and in Jesus’s time appears to have been reckoned as part of the feast, insofar as it was essential preparation – see below – but the actual feast began on Nisan 15<sup>th</sup> and coincided with the eating of the Passover lamb, the actual “*feast of the passover*” John 13:1. (Note that John 13:2 refers to “*supper being ended*” but this supper was “*before the feast of the passover*” and although to “*sup*” in scripture refers to having “*eaten and drunken*” Luke 17:8, Revelation 3:20, a “*supper*” is not the same as a “*feast,*” which is a meal of sumptuous proportions. The “*supper*” eaten “*on the fourteenth day of the month at even*” was ended almost twenty-four hours before the Passover lamb would be eaten on Nisan 15<sup>th</sup>. See more detailed comments below.)

The earliest therefore that Herod could have arrested Peter would have been Nisan 15<sup>th</sup> “*at even*”. However, if it was Herod’s intention to bring Peter forth after the passover, for which there was no apparent reason as Dr. Gipp shows, there would not have been any reason to keep him in prison after the morning of Nisan 15<sup>th</sup>, when the passover feast ended.

Yet Herod had already “*pleased the Jews*” by the murder of James, Acts 12:1-3 and Acts 12:5 states that “*Peter was therefore kept in prison.*” The only reasonable explanation, as discussed by Dr. Gipp, is that the plan was to exhibit Peter after EASTER, possibly to



‘celebrate’ a heathen ‘victory’ over the apostles’ doctrine which had **“filled Jerusalem”** Acts 5:28. This would be getting the most ‘mileage’ out of his efforts to **“vex certain of the church”** in pleasing both Jews and Romans and would not have been the first time that the enemies of the Lord had rejoiced in such a ‘victory’ Judges 16:23-25, 1 Samuel 31:8-13. Significantly there was severe retribution in each of these cases, Judges 16:29, 30, 2 Samuel 5:17-25, Acts 12:23 **“God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap”** Galatians 6:7. Retribution was delayed in the case of the Lord Jesus Christ, in answer to His prayer. See Luke 22:63-66, 23:11, 33, 34.

But there will of course come a day when God will punish the whole world for its rejection of His Son and all its abounding iniquity, Matthew 24:12, Luke 10:16.

**“Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate: and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it...I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity”** Isaiah 13:10, 11.

Herod was not alone in his efforts to **“vex certain of the church”** in pleasing both Jews and Romans. Porcius Festus was **“willing to do the Jews a pleasure”** Acts 25:9 but careful to observe **“the manner of the Romans...that he which is accused have the accusers face to face”** Acts 25:16 while nevertheless seeking to vex Paul with the false accusation **“much learning doth make thee mad”** Acts 26:24.

Another point of significance is that Nisan 14<sup>th</sup> is **“the preparation for the Passover.”**

**“And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King!”** John 19:14.

The **“supper”** Luke 22:20 that the Lord ate with the disciples was part of this preparation.

**“Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?”** Matthew 26:17.

The disciples **“made ready the passover”** verse 19 but the Passover lamb was not slain until later that day. Exodus 12:6-8 stipulates that the Jews were to **“kill it in the evening”** and **“eat the flesh in that night”** extending into Nisan 15<sup>th</sup> and in verse 10 **“ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning”** i.e. of Nisan 15<sup>th</sup>. This timing is clear because the Lord Jesus Christ, **“the lamb of God”** John 1:29, died when evening was drawing on.

**“And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour”** Luke 23:44. The Lord dies in verse 46 because **“he gave up the ghost.”**

The Passover lamb *was yet to be eaten*. Note again John 19:14 and the following references.

**“Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate”** Matthew 27:62. See also Mark 15:42, Luke 23:54, John 19:31, 42.

**“Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the Passover”** John 18:28. See Exodus 12:6-8, 10 above.

Dr. Ruckman<sup>182 p 182-3</sup> states **“According to the calculations of Ainsworth, Christ is slain within one hour of the regular time for killing the Passover lamb, and many converted Rabbis identify the cry of John 19:30 with the descent of the priest’s knife into the neck of the Paschal Lamb.”**

All these references support **“Easter”** in Acts 12:4 because none of them support **“the days of unleavened bread”** which extend beyond Nisan 15<sup>th</sup> and until Nisan 21<sup>st</sup> – see below – as being part of the passover, James White’s erroneous opinion notwithstanding.

David Daniels<sup>43 p 77-8</sup> has these comments about Acts 12:4.

*““Passover” is not the correct translation of pascha in this single New Testament passage. If we examine the Passover celebration and Days of Unleavened Bread from the Old Testament, we will see why Acts 12:4 cannot be about Passover...*

*“Please note when the apostle James was killed: “These were the days of unleavened bread.” When were these days? The Bible is very specific. In Leviticus 23:5-8 and Numbers 28:16-25 we find two very clear definitions of Passover and the Feast/Days of Unleavened Bread.*

- *Passover...occurs on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month at even (starting at sunset).*
- *The Feast and the Days of Unleavened Bread start after Passover, on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of that month (Numbers 28:17) and continuing through the 21<sup>st</sup> day...*

*“Please note that Passover was before the Days of Unleavened Bread [plural], and this pascha Herod was [awaiting] was after the Days of Unleavened Bread. Therefore while Herod may have been waiting for Easter (the feast of Ishstar, which the Greeks also called pascha), he was not waiting for Passover. That is why the King James Bible [translators], in this single instance, had to translate pascha by a word other than Passover.”*

Rev J. A. Moorman<sup>183 p 13-15</sup> explains further, his underlinings. (He notes *“that the word “passover” did not even exist before William Tyndale coined it for his Version of 1526-31. His was also the first English Bible to use “Easter.” Previously the Hebrew and Greek were left untranslated. For example, in Wycliffe’s Bible<sup>46</sup>, which was based on the Latin, we find pask or paske.”* Tyndale’s New Testament<sup>49</sup> and the Bishops’ Bible<sup>138</sup> (and Coverdale<sup>167</sup>) each have **“Easter”** but the Geneva Bible<sup>49</sup> has **“Passover.”** The 1611 Authorized Holy Bible therefore has appreciable, if not total, support from earlier English bibles.

Dr Moorman continues, his underlinings.

*“It is precisely in this one passage that “Easter” must be used, and the translation “Passover” would have conflicted with the immediate context...the passage actually says: “...(Then were the days of unleavened bread)...intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.”*

*“To begin with, the Passover occurred before the feast of unleavened bread [the actual feast begins on Nisan 15<sup>th</sup>], not after! “And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the LORD. And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast: seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten. (Num. 28:16, 17)...*

*“Herod put Peter in Prison during the days of unleavened bread, and therefore after the Passover. The argument that the translation “Passover” should have been used as it is intended to refer to the entire period is ruled out by the inclusion of “these were the days of unleavened bread.” Scripture does not use the word “Passover” to refer to the entire period [according to the first mention of the word **“passover”** in Exodus 12:11. This is important. See Dr Bouw’s comments below].*

*“Peloubet’s Bible Dictionary says: “Strictly speaking the Passover only applied to the paschal supper and the feast of unleavened bread followed it (p. 486).”*

*“Therefore, as the Passover had always been observed, and the days of unleavened bread were in progress, and yet Herod was still waiting for “after pascha;” we can only conclude that the word must be taken in a broader sense. History in fact does indicate a pagan and Christian interchange with the word through the translation “Easter.”*

*“A. W. Watts writes: “The Latin and Greek word for Easter is pascha, which is simply a form of the Hebrew word for Passover – pesach (Easter – its Story and Meaning, p. 36).”*

*“Thus, the word came to be associated with both Christian and pagan observance. And it was to this [latter] that Herod was referring...*

*“Dake’s Bible adds: “Easter...is derived from Ishtar, one of the Babylonian titles of an idol goddess, the Queen of Heaven. The Saxon goddess Eastre is the same as Astarte, the Syrian Venus, called Ashtoreth in the O.T. It was the worship of this woman by Israel that was such an abomination to God (1 Sam. 7:3; 1 Ki. 11:5, 33; 2 Ki. 23:13; Jer. 7:18; 44:18)...*

*“This was the “pascha” that Herod was waiting for before releasing Peter. As an Edomite, he and his people had a long association with Babylon and her mystery religion (cf. Gen. 14:1-4).”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>88 p 356-7</sup> adds, his emphases, this observation that shows how the AV1611 reading “**Easter**” embodies a necessary warning about Catholicism, which warning White overlooked..

*““**AFTER EASTER**” (vs. 4). The Holy Spirit has thrust Himself into the AV committee of 1611 and said, “WRITE...!” Easter was a **Roman Holiday** which **Herod** observed as religiously as any Babylonian priest observed it 1000 years **before** Christ was born. The feast of the Passover matched this pagan feast every few years, and since Herod was a **Roman**, the Holy Spirit has pointed out for you the Catholic feast which **Rome** substituted for the Passover...*

*“To those still ignorant of this bunny, colored-egg day, the Holy Spirit has pointed out the Roman connection...the words “**the days of UNLEAVENED BREAD**” occur in verse 3 (see Exodus 12:2-8 and comments in that Commentary) to give you the **JEWISH** designation. **EASTER** is the **ROMAN** designation, and Herod (vss. 6, 1) was a **Roman**...”*

Given that Herod was a Roman, White has failed to explain why Herod would observe Jewish rather than Roman customs, apart from his irrelevant reference to the extra-biblical source Josephus.

Dr Gerardus Bouw<sup>174 p 229</sup> writes.

*“Note that Peter was taken during the days of unleavened bread (v. 3), the evening of the first day of which [Nisan 14<sup>th</sup>] is the Passover. In time the feast of unleavened bread came to be called the Passover. Luke bore witness of that when he wrote: “Now the feast of unleavened bread drew night, which is called Passover” (Lu. 22:1). In time, the Jews may have confused the two, but the Bible does not do so. Biblically, the Passover is the evening of the first of the seven days of unleavened bread. If Peter was taken during the days of unleavened bread, as Acts 12:3 states, then the Passover was already past and it would be trivial for verse 4 to say that Herod would bring him forth to the people after the Passover.*

*“Easter, on the other hand, is a pagan holiday which periodically coincides with Easter...the reason why in Ac. 12:4 pascha is translated as Easter instead of Passover is*

*that Passover was already past, but in that year the days of unleavened bread ended just before or at Easter time.”*

As noted repeatedly in this work, Will Kinney<sup>184</sup> is a staunch bible believer. He has a somewhat different approach to “**Easter**” in Acts 12:4 than the writers cited above but he nevertheless concludes that “**Easter**” is the correct reading in Acts 12:4. He also notes that, “*The KJV is not alone in translating this word as Easter. The Tyndale 1525, Bishop’s Bible 1568, Coverdale 1535, Matthew’s, Cranmer, the Great Bible (which preceded the KJB)...Martin Luther also translated this word as Easter. The Geneva New Testament was first published in 1557 and read “Easter” in Acts 12:4. When the Old Testament was published in 1560, the New Testament was revised and at that time “easter” was changed to “passover.”*”

In sum, it may be concluded overall that “**Easter**” is correct because it fits the context of “*the days of unleavened bread,*” it matches Herod’s Romish belief system and his desire to please Romans in Jerusalem, having already pleased the Jews with the murder of James, Acts 12:2 and it matches most English and German bibles compiled by faithful bible believers up to and including the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible. Again, it should be noted that like all supposedly ‘disputed’ readings in the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, God has not seen fit to oversee any change to these readings in 400 years, in any bible of any consequence with respect to the blessings of revival and reformation amongst the English-speaking peoples.

White is wrong again.

White<sup>3 p 234-8</sup> concludes this chapter with an attack on the language of the Holy Bible, similar to that of ‘our critic’,<sup>8 p 205-209</sup>. White insists that “*Languages change. They evolve and grow.*” According to White, AV1611 terms like “*“let,” “prevent,” and “communicate” all meant different things to English speakers only a few centuries ago.*”

White therefore argues that, “*language change...is one of the strongest arguments for the revision of older translations or for completely new translations...the logic of the reality [is] that the KJV is written in a form of English that is not readily understandable to people today.*”

White’s statement is ludicrous. Dr Vance<sup>63</sup> reports that since the publication of the Revised Version New Testament in 1881, approximately 200 bible versions have come and mostly gone. Others<sup>39 p 8</sup> have appeared since the publication of Dr Vance’s book in 1993 including the TNIV, Today’s New International Version (as if one wasn’t enough ☺), the HCSB, Holman Christian Standard Bible, the CEV, Contemporary English Version, The ESV, English Standard Version and the ER-KJV, (un)Easy Reading King James Version.

As Dr Grady notes<sup>8 p 206</sup>, “*The “archaic” words of the King James Bible have already been “updated” more than 100 times in as many years for an average of one modern version per year. NOW, WHO’S KIDDING WHOM? Can the English language be changing that fast?*”

And as this author’s earlier work has summarised, only 3-7% of the approximately 10,000 words used in the AV1611 could be described as unfamiliar or altered in meaning and many of these words are little altered from the present-day equivalents. Such relatively minor changes cannot be used to justify the production of a new bible version every six months or so, or indeed any new bible version. After all, the learning of definitions is germane to any genuine field of learning. Why should learning the bible be any different in this respect? White has failed to appreciate this question.

He has also failed to appreciate that nothing can “*evolve and grow*” Psalm 90:10, Isaiah 51:6. Language certainly doesn’t. It decays. Enduring prose such as the works of Shakespeare, John Bunyan’s *The Pilgrim’s Progress* and the classic novels of Dickens are no longer in evidence, even though in the present day “*of making many books there is no end*” Ecclesiastes 12:13. White is not seeing the big picture.

White should also bear in mind the comments of Dr Hills<sup>65 p 218</sup>.

**“Why the King James Version Should be Retained**

*“But, someone may reply, even if the King James Version needs only a few corrections, why take the trouble to make them? Why keep on with the old King James and its 17<sup>th</sup>-century language, its ‘thee’ and ‘thou’ and all the rest? Granted that the Textus Receptus is the best text, but why not make a new translation of it in the language of today? In answer to these objections there are several facts which must be pointed out.*

*“In the first place, the English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version. As H. Wheeler Robinson (1940) pointed out, one need only compare the preface written by the translators with the text of their translation to feel the difference in style. And the observations of W. A. Irwin (1952) are to the same purport. The King James Version, he reminds us, owes its merit, not to 17<sup>th</sup>-century English — which was very different — but to its faithful translation of the original. Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek. Even in their use of ‘thee’ and ‘thou’ the translators were not following 17<sup>th</sup>-century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural ‘you’ in polite conversation...”*

White should also bear in mind the words of HRH, Charles, Prince of Wales.

Dr Ruckman<sup>185</sup> writes, his emphases.

*“According to the Prince of Wales, who is destined to be the next **head** of the Church of England, “Modern English is a wasteland of clichés, obscenity, and banality.” The English Prince, who comes from the land of the **Authorized Version**, that produced the English Protestant Reformation, declares that the English language “has become impoverished, sloppy, and limited, a dismal wasteland (the Daily Telegraph, Dec. 20, 1989, no. 41,832).” The Prince accused the editors of the **New English Bible** and the **Revised Standard Version** of “making changes in the **Authorized Version**, just to lower the tone, and believing that the rest of us wouldn’t get the point if the word of God was a bit over our heads.” The Prince went on, “the word of God is **supposed to be a bit over our heads**, elevated as God is.” Never heard it put better anywhere. It will never be said to anybody over here any better...This is the King with the King’s English, and “**where the word of a King is, there is power**” [Ecclesiastes 8:4a].”*

**“God save the King”** 1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Samuel 16:16, 2 Kings 11:12, 2 Chronicles 23:11.

White has not so far produced any version that has power, according to Ecclesiastes 8:4. Instead of attacking the Holy Bible, his time would have been better spent studying Dr Mrs Riplinger’s works<sup>39 Chapters 1-3, 67</sup> on the AV1611’s built-in dictionary.

Concerning the words that White criticises above, Dr Vance<sup>124</sup> has the following comments. Dr Vance’s work will be summarily cited repeatedly with respect to what White disdains as the “*form of English that is not readily understandable to people today.*”

Dr Vance shows that the word “*let*” and the derivative “*letteth*” in the sense of ‘to hinder’ occur 4 times in the AV1611 and he notes that the term is still used in this sense of a ball hitting the net in tennis. This is the sense of the words “*letteth*” and “*let*” in 2 Thessalonians 2:7, to which White objects<sup>3 p 237</sup>. These words are defined as “*withholdeth*” in verse 6 but White failed to notice this definition.

However, the word “*let*” in its current meaning occurs over 2,000 times in an AV1611.

The word “*prevent*” and derivatives occur a mere 17 times in the AV1611. Dr Vance shows that it is used in the sense of “*to come before*,” a meaning evident in the word itself, which consists of two words, pre-event, as Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>67 p 84</sup> has shown.

The words “*communicate*” and “*communicated*” occur only 6 times in the AV1611, in the sense of “*to make common*” or ‘to impart, give,’ which is similar to the use of the related word “*commune*,” with respect to giving information, as the word could be used today.

**“And Saul commanded his servants, saying, Commune with David secretly, and say, Behold, the king hath delight in thee, and all his servants love thee: now therefore be the king’s son in law”** 1 Samuel 18:22.

A similar meaning is found in Acts 2:44, with respect to the distribution of goods amongst the early church.

**“And all that believed were together, and had all things common.”**

As in the meaning of “*prevent*,” the meaning of “*communicate*” emerges from a study of the word itself and the context in which it is used. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* also gives ‘to share a thing’ as one of the meanings of the word communicate, even today.

White is wilfully ignorant, 1 Corinthians 14:38.

But White further insists that, “*It is actually asserted that the KJV is the simplest, easiest to read version of the Bible* [‘Bible’ still unspecified].” He cites Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work<sup>14 p 195-217</sup> in a note<sup>3 p 241</sup> but evades discussion of any of her material, such as the results of the Flesch-Kincaid research, which found that the AV1611 was the easiest bible to read in 23 out of 26 comparisons, the incidence of more difficult words in modern versions such as the NASV and the increased number of syllables in the NIV, which make memorisation of scripture more difficult. See also this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 32-3, 205ff</sup> for a summary.

White’s comment is another example of what Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 289</sup> has referred to as the Catholic method of writing church history – see above. “*You make a shocking statement which you trust will shake up your reader so badly due to his lack of information that he will side with you without demanding information.*”

White’s ploy is seen for what it is when the information is examined.

White proceeds with more examples from the AV1611, some culled from other bible critics like himself “*that few modern readers...would understand*” and that are supposedly ‘corrected’ by the modern versions. These examples are too numerous to address in detail and will therefore be considered in summary form only, except where White’s examples have been specifically answered by others, e.g. Will Kinney.

White’s examples have been listed in turn, with accompanying responses.

**“*Fetched a compass*”** Joshua 15:3, 2 Kings 3:9, Acts 28:13 should be “*turned about*” or similar as in the NASV. White’s criticism of the AV1611’s use of this phrase includes

the statement, his emphasis, “*Some might even think that the expression refers to an actual compass, which, of course, did not exist at the times in which these passages were written.*” So why does White condone the NASV’s expression “*four points of the compass*” in Daniel 11:4 that Dr Vance highlights? Dr Vance shows further that ‘correction’ of the phrase “*fetch a compass*” was unnecessary because similar expressions are still used in contemporary documents and the dictionary meaning is ‘a roundabout way,’ as in the scriptures. A somewhat circuitous route may have been necessary in Acts 28:13, in order to avoid reefs or shoals and/or to take advantage of favourable winds, as the verse itself suggests, with the statement that “*the south wind blew.*” In other words, it is not difficult to discern the meaning of the expression from the scriptures themselves. White is gnat-straining to think otherwise.

Will Kinney’s<sup>186</sup> insightful comment follows.

*“We fetched a compass*

*“Acts 28:12-13 “And landing at Syracuse, we tarried there three days. And from thence WE FETCHED A COMPASS, and came to Rhegium: and after one day the south wind blew, and we came the next day to Puteoli.”*

*“In his book, The King James Only Controversy, author James White says on page 234: “One could easily fill many pages with examples of unclear, difficult readings based upon archaic language from the KJV.” He then shows three verses where the phrase “fetch a compass” is used in the King James Bible, and then comments: “Surely ‘fetched a compass’ is a phrase that few modern readers, even those skilled in such things, would understand. Some might even think that the expression refers to an actual compass, which, of course, did not exist at the times in which these passages were written. This kind of difficult reading is hardly a rarity, especially in the Old Testament portion of the KJV.”*

*“Of course Mr. White is trying to get us to abandon that dusty old King James Bible and embrace his NASB or the NIV. Apparently the facts that the NASB and NIV omit or substitute some 5000 words from the New Testament of the King James Bible (including 17 whole verses) and they both often reject the Hebrew text in favor of the Greek Septuagint, Syriac, or the Vulgate; or the fact that they do not even agree with each other in hundreds of verses, and both contain proveable contradictions and theological errors, is of little importance. The main thing Mr. White is concerned about is getting rid of difficult readings like “fetched a compass”.*

*“James White and others like him do not believe that any single Book called the Holy Bible is actually the complete, inerrant, inspired words of God. I know this for a fact, having read his book several times and having talked with him both on the radio and the internet. All he has to recommend his readers are a variety of multiple-choice, Let’s Hope They’re Close Enuf, conflicting and contradictory “reliable versions”. But an actual paper and ink Book we can hold in our hands and believe every word of it? Nah, no such thing exists in James White’s thinking.*

*“This phrase “to fetch a compass” admittedly is not as common as it once was, but if you merely think about it just a bit, you can easily figure out what it means. To fetch is to get or obtain, and a compass is something that forms a circle. So to fetch a compass means to go around or turn in a wide circular motion.*

*“Do modern English versions still use such “archaic” words like “compass” and “fetch”. Of course they do. In the 2001 English Standard Version we see the word “compass” meaning to circle something.*

*“ESV 2 Samuel 22:5 “For the waves of death encompassed me, the torrents of destruction assailed me;”*

*“ESV 1 Kings 7:24 “Under its brim were gourds, for ten cubits, compassing the sea all around. The gourds were in two rows, cast with it when it was cast.”*

*“ESV Psalm 22:12 “Many bulls encompass me; strong bulls of Bashan surround me;”*

*“ESV Isaiah 44:13 “The carpenter stretches a line; he marks it out with a pencil. He shapes it with planes and marks it with a compass.”*

*“Is fetch archaic? Not according to the NASB, NKJV...and others.*

*“NASB, NKJV - Job 36:3 “I will fetch my knowledge from afar, And I will ascribe righteousness to my Maker”...*

*“This English expression is not that hard to figure out, and those who criticize it know full well what it means. What many may not be aware of is the fact that the phrase is still found in modern dictionaries.*

*“Dictionary.Com*

*““Fetch*

*““1. To bear toward the person speaking, or the person or thing from whose point of view the action is contemplated; to go and bring; to get.*

*“““Time will run back and fetch the age of gold.” - Milton.*

*“““He called to her, and said, Fetch me, I pray thee, a little water in a vessel, that I may drink. And as she was going to fetch it he called to her, and said, Bring me, I pray thee, a morsel of bred in thine hand.” - 1 Kings xvii. 11, 12.*

*““2. To obtain as price or equivalent; to sell for.*

*“““Our native horses were held in small esteem, and fetched low prices.” - Macaulay.*

*““5. To bring to accomplishment; to achieve; to make; to perform, with certain objects; as, TO FETCH A COMPASS, to fetch a leap; to fetch a sigh.*

*““6. To bring or get within reach by going; to reach; to arrive at; to attain; TO REACH BY SAILING.*

*“““Meantime flew our ships, and straight we fetched The siren’s isle.” - Chapman.*

*““TO FETCH A COMPASS (Nautical), to make a circuit; to take a circuitous route going to a place.*

*“To fetch a compass - to make a circuit.”*

*“Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary 1998*

*““To Fetch*

*““1 : to get and bring something; specifically : to retrieve killed game 2 : to take a roundabout way: TO CIRCLE 3 : to hold a course on a body of water “*

*“Webster’s Dictionary 1913*

*““To fetch a compass (Naut.), to make a circuit; to take a circuitous route going to a place.”*

*“The Collaborative International Dictionary of English*



““to fetch a compass”

““A passing round; circuit; circuitous course.”

“““They fetched a compass of seven day’s journey.” 2 Kings iii. 9.

“What many Christians seem to be unaware of, or even unconcerned about, regarding the Bible Version issue is that there is far more involved than just updating a few “archaic words”. There is the supremely important question concerning the very words God Himself inspired. Do we have a complete, inerrant, infallible and inspired Bible today or not? God promised to preserve His words and the Lord Jesus Christ said “heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.” This is either a true statement or else the Lord Jesus lied to us.

“Here are just two of the hundreds of examples that can be given to illustrate the point. Both are found in Acts chapter 28 where we find the expression “From thence we fetched a compass, and came to Rhegium.”

“In Acts 28:16 we read: “And when we came to Rome, **THE CENTURION DELIVERED THE PRISONERS TO THE CAPTAIN OF THE GUARD:** but Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him.”

“All the capital lettered words are found in the majority of all Greek texts, as well as some Old Latin copies, the Syriac Harkelian, Coptic Sahidic and Slavonic ancient versions. These words are also in the NKJV, the Spanish Reina Valera, Italian Diodati, the modern Greek Bibles, Young’s, Darby, Hebrew Names Version, and the previous English bibles of Tyndale, Coverdale, Bishops’ and the Geneva Bible.

“However, based on a few Greek manuscripts that constantly disagree with each other, modern versions like the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV and Holman Standard omit all these capitalized words.

“In Acts 28:29 we read: “**AND WHEN HE HAD SAID THESE WORDS, THE JEWS DEPARTED, AND HAD GREAT REASONING AMONG THEMSELVES.**”

“This entire verse is omitted from the text by such versions as the NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV... The NASB is of interest in that from 1960 through 1972 the NASB omitted this verse from its text and consigned it to a marginal note saying: “**SOME** manuscripts add...” Then in 1977 and again in 1995 the NASB decided to put the verse back in the text, but this time in brackets, indicating that it is not part of the original text. Then they footnote: “**MANY** manuscripts do not contain this verse.”

“The 2004 Holman Standard includes the verse but places it in brackets

“The entire verse is found in the vast majority of all remaining Greek copies as well as many Old Latin copies. The Old Latin translation predates anything we have in Greek. It is also found in Lamsa’s 1933 translation of the Syriac Peshitta, the Armenian, Ethiopic and Slavonic ancient versions and is quoted by church fathers including Chrysostom and Cassiodorus. Since the verse occurs only one time in the New Testament, it would be a bit difficult for an early church father to quote it if it did not exist.

“The entire verse is found in the following foreign language Bible versions: The Albanian, Arabic, Bulgarian, Chinese, Danish, Dutch, French Louis Segond, German Luther, Modern Greek, Gypsy Rhoanese, Haitian Creole, Modern Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian Diodati, Korean, Latvian, Maori Bible, Norwegian, Portuguese, Rumanian, Russian, Shuar N.T., Spanish Reina Valera, Turkish, Uma New Testament, and the Vietnamese Bible.

*“Yet in this country such versions as the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NASB, Holman Standard...all omit this verse entirely from their New Testament text, or else they place it in brackets indicating it is not inspired Scripture.*

*“It is a simple matter. Either these words and thousands of others found in the King James Bible are the inspired words of the living God or else they are human additions that have no place at all, even in brackets, in the Holy Bible.”*

Why does White bypass two major ‘textual variations’ in the same chapter in order to focus on a supposedly unfamiliar expression the meaning of which is nevertheless readily available, as Kinney has shown? White fails to address this question. Proverbs 11:1a bears repeating.

**“A false balance is abomination to the LORD.”**

**“Meat offering”** Leviticus 14:10 should be “grain offering” as in the NASV. The NASV is at best imprecise because Leviticus 14:10 refers to an offering of **“fine flour,”** which is not grain. White and the modern versions have overlooked a scriptural significance of the term **“meat”** that Dr Ruckman<sup>187 p 45-6</sup> notes.

*““For meat” is the AV1611 definition of any kind of food. There is no need for “a better translation.” The Bible is self-definitive and since Bread is a type of the flesh (Genesis 40:16, 17; 2 Samuel 13:5-9; 1 Chronicles 21:23), either “meat” or “bread” will do for any kind of a meal (Lev 2:4, 5:13, 6:20).”*

White seems to be unaware that the term ‘sweetmeat’ exists in modern English as a sugar or chocolate concoction and ‘sweetbread’ is an offal food, so the AV1611 terms still find modern usage.

In sum, although **“meat”** occurs repeatedly in the AV1611, it is clearly defined and poses no problem.

**“Road”** 1 Samuel 27:10 should be **“raid”** as in the NASV. Dr Vance indicates that **“road”** in the AV1611 is from an Old English word meaning ‘raid’ but this is also the sense of the modern term ‘inroad,’ which could suggest a raid in some depth, as is implied by 1 Samuel 27:11. The AV1611 word is therefore superior to the word **“raid.”** **“Road”** occurs once in the AV1611.

**“To fetch about this form of speech”** 2 Samuel 14:20 should be **“to change the present situation”** as in the NIV. White is here opting for a **“much easier”** reading. He therefore switches to the NIV from the NASV, which has **“in order to change the appearance of things,”** using two more words than the supposedly ‘wordy’ AV1611. White is making up his ‘bible’ as he goes.

The AV1611 reading is not difficult to understand and in view of the preceding verse, it is precise, whereas the NIV and NASV alternatives are vague.

**“For thy servant Joab, he bade me, and he put all these words in the mouth of thine handmaid”** 2 Samuel 14:19b. See also Exodus 4:15, Numbers 22:38. With slight alteration, the expression **“put all these words in the mouth”** is commonly in contemporary use. Why did White not note this fact?

**“Target”** in 1 Samuel 17:6 should be **“javelin”** as in the NASV.

White describes the word **“target”** as **“amusing”** but both versions refer to Goliath’s implement as located **“between his shoulders.”** In the first place, how is a javelin **“slung”** between the shoulders, as the NASV reads? The NASV reading could only be correct if

the weapon was looped around Goliath's neck, a method of carriage too awkward to contemplate – see verse 7. And since when have throwing instruments, like javelins, been encumbered with buckles for necessarily carrying via a sling – the lower end of which would be *outside* the wearer's shoulder above it? Depictions of ancient warriors armed with spears or javelins always show these weapons being hand held or resting on one shoulder for the march.

Dr Vance gives the correct meaning of “**target**” as ‘a shield or buckler’ and related to the contemporary English word ‘targe,’ which has the same meaning – it is possible that targets in the contemporary sense were developed originally from targets that had first been used as shields, which is the sense of Ephesians 6:16.

**“Above all, taking *the shield of faith*, wherewith ye shall be able to *quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.*”**

Moreover, the meaning of “**target**” as in 1 Kings 10:16, the second of only three occurrences of the word in scripture, is found by means of the AV1611's built in-dictionary in verse 17, which refers to “**shields**” and “**shield.**” See also 2 Chronicles 9:15, 16.

James White's ignorance of English vocabulary is matched by his ignorance of the scriptures.

“**Turtle**” in Song of Solomon 2:12 should be “*turtledove*” as in the NASV, although the first meaning of the word “*turtle*” in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* is with respect to doves, not reptiles. Will Kinney<sup>165</sup> responds to White as follows.

*“The Turtle... - James White follies*

*“THE TURTLE = turtledove*

*“James White, in his book *the King James Only Controversy*, pokes fun at the King James Bible's use of the word “turtle” when referring to the turtledove. Mr. White says on page 235 in the section titled *Problems in the KJV*: “This is almost as humorous as Song of Songs 2:12, “The flowers appear on the earth: the time of the singing of the birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.” Then Mr. White comments: “Turtles are not known for their voices, and how these would be connected with flowers and the singing of birds is unknown. Of course, the passage is not referring to turtles at all, but to the turtledove, as the modern translations recognize.”*

*“Mr. White himself does not believe any Bible in any language or any text, be it Hebrew or Greek, is the preserved, inspired words of God. Mr. White also works for the NASB committee and apparently doesn't mind representing a version like the NASB that says God can be deceived in Psalms 78:36, or that God doesn't take away life in 2 Samuel 14:14; or that there are two Gods, one not seen and one begotten in John 1:18; or that Jonah was not swallowed by a whale but by a “sea monster” in Matthew 12:40. Likewise, the NASB departs from the Hebrew texts scores of times and is continually changing its underlying Greek texts from one edition to the next; but he does have a bee in his bonnet with the KJB's use of the word “turtle” instead of turtledove.*

*“Such are the ways of those who attack God's pure words as found in the King James Holy Bible.*

*“Here are a few facts James may not be aware of. The Hebrew word is translated both as turtle and turtledove in the King James Bible and several others too. One of the meanings of the word turtle is a turtledove, and the context always indicates that we are speaking about a bird and not the shelled reptile.*

*“Here is another example of context clearly showing the Bible is speaking of a bird when it uses the word turtle. In Jeremiah 8:7 we read: “Yea, the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the TURTLE and the crane and the swallow observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the judgment of the LORD” ...*

*““Smith’s Bible Dictionary*

*““Turtle, turtledove Turtur auritus (Heb. tor). The name is phonetic, evidently derived from the plaintive cooing of the bird.”*

*“Some dictionaries do not even list “turtle”, meaning the turtledove, as archaic.*

*“Webster’s 1913 Dictionary “Turtle noun. Anglo Saxon. turtle, L. turtur; probably of imitative origin. (Zoöl.) The turtledove.”*

*“Definitions from The Online Plain Text English Dictionary: “Turtle \*(n.) Any one of the numerous species of Testudinata, especially a sea turtle, or chelonian. \*(n.) The curved plate in which the form is held in a type-revolving cylinder press. \*(n.) The turtledove.”*

*“A similar word in English that can have several meanings is the simple word cow. When we say cow, are we referring to the bovine creature that gives milk, or to a whale, a seal or an elephant? The context will usually tell us which one is meant. In every case where the word “turtle” is used in the King James Bible and all the others listed that have come after the KJB, it is clear that the bird also known as the turtle dove is intended. Mr. White is again straining at gnats and mocking the time-tested word of God as found in the King James Bible.”*

*“**Turtle**” occurs only twice in the AV1611. However, given the importance that White<sup>3 p 77</sup> attaches to marginal notes in the AV1611, did he not check the cross references (in the Cambridge cameo Wide-Margin AV1611), Psalm 74:19 **“turtledove”** Jeremiah 8:7 **“stork...turtle...crane...swallow.”** Did he not check Song of Solomon 2:14, **“dove”**?*

*“**Knit at the four corners**” in Acts 10:11 should be “lowered by four corners” as in the NASV. Will Kinney<sup>188</sup> has these comments.*

*“James White - Blind Bible Scholar. This is a series of articles dealing with some issues Mr. White brings up in his book, and my conversation with him at an online discussion group.*

*“Acts 10:11 “And saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth”*

*“Normally I would not even address the minor textual issue brought up by examining Acts 10:11, but since Mr. James White makes such a big deal of it in his book, The King James Only Controversy, I feel I should address the issue.*

*“In chapter nine of his book, which is titled “Problems in the KJV”, James lists several silly objections to the language and text of the King James Bible, all of which can easily be refuted. Of course he is “not attacking the King James Bible”, you understand, but is merely pointing out areas where it contains errors or is based on what he calls “inferior texts”. James White has no infallible, inspired, complete Holy Bible to recommend to anyone, but sets himself up as the voice of reason and authority in the midst of a complicated and difficult issue.*

*“Let’s get specific here and look at one such example of the “superior scholarship” prof-fered to us by the good doctor on page 236 of ‘The KJV Controversy’.*

*“Mr. White writes: “The KJV New Testament is not without its intriguing passages as well. For example, Peter saw a vision that is described in the AV, “And saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending UNTO HIM (caps mine), as it had been a great sheet KNIT (caps mine) at the four corners, and let down to the earth” - Acts 10:11. One could completely miss the point here, for the KJV has “knit” for a term that refers to the means by which the sheet was lowered, hence the NASB, “lowered by four corners to the ground.””*

*“Most people who read Mr. White’s book would automatically assume that he knows what he is talking about. After all, James has gone to seminary, he knows Hebrew and Greek, and surely he would not print something that was not true, would he?”*

*“Actually James White is totally in error at every point, and I am somewhat amazed that he would even put such an example in his book. He must be really hard up for examples of where the KJB supposedly dropped the ball.*

*“First of all, Mr. White is woefully incorrect when he says the KJB has “knit” for a term that refers to the means by which the sheet was lowered. No, what has happened here is that there are two different textual readings, one followed by all Reformation Bibles including that of Luther, the Geneva Bible, Bishops’ Bible, Coverdale, Tyndale, the Italian Diodati, the Spanish Reina Valera, and the French Louis Segond; and another different Greek reading followed by the modern versions which have adopted the Westcott-Hort texts. How James White could miss this obvious truth is the only thing that is “intriguing”.*

*“The reading of “knit at the four corners” or “bound at the four corners” is found in the vast majority of all remaining Greek texts, as well as P45 which dates to the third century and is older by at least 100 years than the reading found in Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, from which the NASB, NIV, RSV were translated. So the NASB, NIV, RSV aren’t even following the oldest reading here, but a minority reading found in the notoriously corrupt, confused, and contradictory Sinaiticus-Vaticanus texts - as usual.*

*“The Traditional Greek Texts says: kai katabainon ep auton skeuos ti ws oqonhn megalhn tessarsin arcais dedemenon kai kaqiemenon epi ths ghs, while the Alexandrian text underlying the NASB, NIV, RSV has: kai katabainon skeuos ti ws oqonhn megalhn tessarsin arcais kaqiemenon epi ths ghs.*

*“The glaring differences between these two different texts here is that the words for “knit” and “upon him” are in most Greek texts but are omitted by the few upon which the NASB, NIV are based. The information provided by Mr. White is completely wrong.*

*“In his book, James White recommends three different bible versions as being “reliable” - the NKJV, NASB, and the NIV; Surprise!!! - the only one he doesn’t recommend is the Authorized King James Holy Bible. These three versions that Mr. White recommends differ from each other in hundreds of verses either in meaning or text. The NKJV is based on a very different Greek text (5000 words worth of differences) than that of the NIV, NASB. Yet, the NKJV which Mr. White recommends contains the same reading as that found in the KJB which he criticizes! The NKJV says: “and saw heaven opened and an object like a great sheet BOUND AT the four corners, descending TO HIM and let down to the earth.”*

*“The NASB says: “and he beheld the sky opened up, and a certain object like a great sheet coming down, lowered by four corners to the ground.” Notice that this reading entirely omits both “knit” (or bound) and “upon him”.*

*“Not only does the King James Bible say “descending UNTO HIM, as it had been a great sheet KNIT AT the four corners” but so also do the Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Bishops’ Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599.... The NKJV, as well as Young’s, and Darby say: “descending UNTO HIM...BOUND AT the four corners.”*

*“James White has committed another blunder in his vain attempts to overthrow the authority of God’s pure words as found in the King James Bible. He has no Final Authority but his own mind and would like very much for you to join him and his merry Bible of the Month Club Band to find out what God REALLY said.”*

White also forgot to check Acts 11:5.

*“I was in the city of Joppa praying: and in a trance I saw a vision, A certain vessel descend, as it had been a great sheet, let down from heaven by four corners; and it came even to me.”*

It was James White<sup>3 p 158-9</sup> who insisted that, his emphases *“In each instance where the NIV lacks a phrase in its text that is found in the KJV, that same material is found elsewhere in the NIV New Testament....”* See remarks in *Chapters 4, 7.*

By James White’s ‘standard,’ the AV1611 reading should not be criticised for reading differently from the modern versions in Acts 10:11, because, to paraphrase White, *“In [this] instance where the AV1611 lacks a phrase in its text that is found in the NIV, NASV, that same material is found elsewhere in the AV1611 New Testament....”*

White is a hypocrite. Again, he is being ‘inconsistent’ and resorting to a ‘double standard.’

White does not appreciate that the sheet has been made into a sack, in order to hold its contents. That is why it is *“let down from heaven by four corners.”* *“Knit”* occurs 6 times in the AV1611.

*“Wealth”* in 1 Corinthians 10:24 should be *“good”* as in the NASV. White thinks that the AV1611 reading implies *“handling investments.”*

He forgot to read 1 Corinthians 10:33, which explains verse 24, with particular application to salvation.

*“Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved.”*

1 Corinthians 10:33 relates back to Mark 10:21, a verse that White<sup>3 p 158-162, 166</sup> viciously attacks. See remarks in *Chapter 7.*

*“Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow me.”*

The word *“wealth”* occurs 27 times in the AV1611, mostly in the modern sense. Dr Vance indicates that it occurs 5 times in the older sense of ‘welfare’ or ‘well-being,’ 1 Samuel 2:32, Ezra 9:12, Esther 10:3, Job 21:13, 1 Corinthians 10:24.

The sense of Paul’s statement is in keeping with a similar exhortation in Philippians 2:3, 4 and the meaning of the term *“wealth”* in 1 Corinthians 10:24 is therefore clear.

*“Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.”*

White would probably complain that it is too “*laborious*” to “*search the scriptures*” John 5:39 but doing so sheds additional light on the meaning of the term “*wealth*.”

*“For Mordecai the Jew was next unto king Ahasuerus, and great among the Jews, and accepted of the multitude of his brethren, seeking the wealth of his people, and speaking peace to all his seed”* Esther 10:3.

*“When Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the servant, the Ammonite, heard of it, it grieved them exceedingly that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel”* Nehemiah 2:10.

Again, the AV1611 proves to be self-interpreting. White says of the King James translators that they were “*quite free with their terms*” but fails to mention that where they correctly translated *heteros, ετερον*, as “*another’s*,” the NASV’s substitution of “*neighbour’s*” does not correspond to any meaning<sup>71</sup> given for *heteros*.

*“Feebleminded”* in 1 Thessalonians 5:14 should be “*fainthearted*” as in the NASV. White refers to the RSV, which reads as the NASV. The verse states, “*Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feebleminded, support the weak, be patient toward all men.*”

Dr Vance confirms that “*febleminded*” does mean ‘weak,’ confirming that the adjacent, underlined phrases in the verse show yet again that the AV1611 is its own interpreter. “*Feebleminded*” occurs once in the AV1611.

*“Purchase to themselves a good degree”* 1 Timothy 3:13 should be “*obtain a high standing for themselves*”<sup>3 p 241</sup> NASV. The modern reading yields no enlightenment. As Dr Ruckman<sup>16 p 68</sup> points out, the term “*degree*” refers to God’s evaluation of the individual, or the world’s, Psalm 62:9. “*A good degree*” is God’s spiritual commendation in this life for faithful service, after the manner of Hebrews 6:10, speaking practically. “*De-gree*” occurs 7 times in the AV1611 in the sense of position in God’s sight.

*“For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.”*

White also objects to “*quit you like men*” 1 Corinthians 16:13, “*superfluity of naughtiness*” James 1:21 and to the word “*quick*” or “*quicken*” Psalm 119:25, John 5:21, Hebrews 4:12 “*that the KJV never uses in the modern sense of “fast.”*”

The AV1611 does, however, use the adverb “*quickly*” in the modern sense, on 38 occasions in both Testaments, as in Genesis 18:6, the first occurrence of the word in the scriptures.

*“And Abraham hastened into the tent unto Sarah, and said, Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth.”*

Dr Vance explains that “*quick*” in the AV1611 derives from an old English word meaning ‘living,’ from which the contemporary meaning of ‘fast’ or ‘prompt’ was derived. But the adverb “*quickly*” does suggest that vigour and liveliness are associated with the related word “*quick*.”

The words “*quick*,” “*quicken*,” “*quickeneth*” occur 28 times in the AV1611. Many of these references indicate that these words are associated with life and the giving or restoration of life, including spiritual life, even with respect to the simple and indeed contemporary expression, “*the quick and the dead*” Acts 10:42, 2 Timothy 4:1, 1 Peter 4:5. Note these additional references, showing again that the AV1611 defines its own terms.

***“For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will”*** John 5:21.

***“It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life”*** John 6:63.

***“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword”*** Hebrews 4:12a.

***“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”*** 1 Peter 1:23.

It is interesting that the first meaning for ‘quick’ in the dictionary is ‘living’ and ‘alive’ and the second meaning given is ‘lively’ and ‘vigorous,’ all of which meanings appear to be encompassed in the AV1611 usage of the words.

Concerning White’s objection to the word ***“quit,”*** Dr Vance notes that this word appears a mere 6 times in the AV1611, so its meaning, or meanings, should not in themselves be a serious burden to the reader. On 4 of these occasions, the word is used in the legal sense of a release from an obligation, which meaning remains in contemporary usage.

The remaining 2 uses of the word are with respect to conduct, in 1 Corinthians 16:13 and 1 Samuel 4:9 and the meaning is clear. As Dr Ruckman<sup>143 p 370-1</sup> indicates, the exhortation is to ***“play the man”*** 2 Samuel 10:12 with determined action.

***“Be strong, and quit yourselves like men, O ye Philistines, that ye be not servants unto the Hebrews, as they have been to you: quit yourselves like men, and fight.”***

The dictionary meaning for ‘quit’ includes both the biblical meanings of ‘to be free from’ and ‘behave,’ ‘acquit’ of ‘conduct.’

White’s objection to ***“superfluity”*** is unreasonable because this word remains in current use today, as Dr Vance notes. ***“Naughtiness”*** occurs 3 times in the AV1611. It is associated with ***“pride”*** 1 Samuel 17:28, ***“transgressors”*** Proverbs 11:6 and ***“filthiness”*** James 1:21 and is thus a description of evil, which is worthless to God as the embedded word ***“naught”*** implies. Dr Vance and the dictionary both give ‘wickedness’ as the meaning of ***“naughtiness,”*** even though contemporary use tends to restrict the application of the word to children. However, that usage is still consistent with scripture. See Ephesians 2:2 ***“children of disobedience,”*** Ephesians 2:3 ***“children of wrath”*** and ***“cursed children”*** 2 Peter 2:14.

According to White, Dr Edwin Palmer, of the NIV translating committee, see ***Chapter 5,*** cannot understand the following words in the AV1611. The list reveals as much about White’s and Palmer’s ignorance of English as it does about ‘unfamiliar’ or ‘archaic’ words in the AV1611.

***“Chambering”*** Romans 13:13. ***“Chambering”*** occurs once in the AV1611 but the AV1611 uses ***“chamber”*** repeatedly to denote a room, including a ***“bedchamber”*** Exodus 8:3. The association with the word ***“wantonness”*** gives the meaning of ***“chambering”*** even if White and Palmer couldn’t discern it. The dictionary meaning, though said to be ‘archaic,’ is ‘licentiousness.’

***“Champaign”*** Deuteronomy 11:30. The dictionary meaning of this word is an ‘expanse of open country,’ as Dr Vance likewise indicates, noting that the word is related to the contemporary term ‘campus.’ Deuteronomy 11:30 also contains the word ***“plains,”*** according to the AV1611’s built-in dictionary, although White and Palmer missed it.



**“Champaign”** only occurs once in the AV1611.

**“Charger”** Matthew 14:8. White/Palmer think the word could be confused with ‘horse,’ but the first meaning of the word in the dictionary is ‘a wide, flat, dish,’ consistent, as Dr Vance states, with the basic meaning of the word, ‘to carry a load.’ In Numbers 7, the charger is mentioned 13 times, each time in association with a bowl and a spoon. What would White/Palmer think the word means, in that context? What does a (soup) bowl usually rest upon? Has neither White nor Palmer ever been to a restaurant?

**“Churl”** Isaiah 32:7. Dr Vance and the dictionary indicate that this word refers to a ‘low...ill bred fellow.’ The meaning of the word in scripture is apparent from Isaiah 32:5, 6 which refer to **“the vile person.”** **“Churl”** and the related word **“churlish”** occur 3 times in the AV1611.

**“Cieled”** Haggai 1:4. Dr Vance indicates that this word is spelt **“ceiled”** in some editions of the AV1611 but either spelling clearly relates to the familiar English word ‘ceiling.’ This is how the word or its derivative **“cieling”** is used in each of the 5 occasions it is found in the AV1611, the first of these being 1 Kings 6:15, where **“cieling”** occurs, clearly in the sense of ‘ceiling.’ Dr Mrs Riplinger indicates that the unusual spelling **“ciel”**<sup>67 p 59</sup> is nevertheless familiar to non-English speakers. Spanish, French and Italian speakers often recognise AV1611 terms much more readily than their modern counterparts, which facilitates learning of English for foreign students of the language.

**“Circumspect”** Exodus 23:13. This author disputes that **“circumspect”** is an ‘archaic’ word. Palmer and White are simply ignorant of English. Both Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning of the word as ‘cautious,’ ‘wary.’ The companion word in Ephesians 5:15 is **“circumspectly”** and as that verse itself indicates, the meaning of the word is **“wise”** or ‘discreet,’ ‘prudent’ as the dictionary indicates and matching the meanings ‘cautious,’ ‘wary.’ It is **“wise”** to **“make no mention of the name of other gods.”** **“Circumspect”** and its companion word **“circumspectly”** occur twice in an AV1611.

**“Clouted”** Joshua 9:5. As Dr Vance and the dictionary indicate, a **“clout”** is a piece of cloth or a rag. The word **“clout”** is defined as such in Jeremiah 38:11, 12, which Palmer and White failed to see on both occasions. **“Clout”** and **“clouted”** occur 3 times in the AV1611.

**“So Ebedmelech took the men with him, and went into the house of the king under the treasury, and took thence old cast clouts and old rotten rags, and let them down by cords into the dungeon to Jeremiah”** Jeremiah 38:11.

**“Cockatrice”** Isaiah 11:8. All 3 references to the word in the AV1611 indicate that a **“cockatrice”** is any venomous serpent, such as an **“asp”** Isaiah 11:8. Dr Vance confirms this meaning of the word, as does the dictionary, although via a related word, ‘basilisk.’

Note however, Jeremiah 8:17, **“For, behold, I will send serpents, cockatrices, among you, which will not be charmed, and they shall bite you, saith the LORD.”**

The meaning of the word in question is given *next to the word itself*. How much plainer, Proverbs 8:9, do White, Palmer and co. want the word of God to be?

**“Collops”** Job 15:27. The word simply refers to folds of human or animal fat, as the verse indicates and as Dr Vance and the dictionary confirm. Like several of the so-called ‘unfamiliar’ or ‘archaic’ words in the AV1611 considered so far, this word occurs only once in the scripture. Other such terms, like **“cockatrice”** above, occur only a few times and therefore do not present a serious burden for the sincere reader of the Holy Bible, AV1611, who trusts the promise of John 16:13.

**“Confection”** Exodus 30:35. White/Palmer think the reader might confuse the word with sugar but the verse states, **“And thou shalt make it a perfume, a confection after the art of the apothecary, tempered together, pure and holy.”** The reference is clearly to a blended substance and the dictionary meaning is ‘mixing.’ **“Confection”** occurs twice in the AV1611.

**“Cotes”** 2 Chronicles 32:28. **“Cotes”** occurs once in the AV1611 and 3 times as **“sheep-cote(s)”** 1 Samuel 24:3, 2 Samuel 7:7, 1 Chronicles 17:7, i.e. a mere 4 times in all. Dr Vance and the dictionary indicate that the word means ‘stall’ or ‘shed,’ especially for storage or animals and 2 Chronicles 32:28 includes the word **“stalls”** that White and Palmer overlooked. Dr Vance indicates that the contemporary word ‘cottage’ derives from **“cotes”** so far from using ‘archaic’ words, the AV1611 reveals to genuine students of scripture the roots of English.

**“Covert”** 2 Kings 16:18. Dr Vance and the dictionary indicate that the word means ‘a shelter’ or ‘hiding place,’ as is evident from the embedded word ‘cover,’ which White and Palmer missed. The word appears 9 times in the AV1611, associated with **“dens”** in Job 38:40, **“refuge”** in Isaiah 4:6 and **“hiding place”** in Isaiah 32:2. The AV1611 is again self-interpreting.

This author disputes that **“covert”** is ‘archaic.’ ‘Covert operations’ are an established feature of modern warfare, as Dr Vance also notes.

**“Hoised”** Acts 27:40. The meaning is clear from the verse, **“hoised up the mainsail to the wind.”** The word simply means to raise up, or hoist. The dictionary gives ‘hoise’ as an older spelling of ‘hoist.’ **“Hoised”** occurs once in the AV1611.

**“Wimples”** Isaiah 3:22. This plural term is another that occurs only once in the AV1611 and therefore poses no serious problem for the honest reader. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘a covering for the head and neck,’ which meaning is apparent from the associated words **“apparel”** and **“mantles”** in the verse. A **“mantle”** is a cloth garment that can be used to cover the face, 1 Kings 19:13.

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger extends the meaning of the word to include **“a curl of hair”** in addition to **“a pinched fabric veil.”**

**“Stomacher”** Isaiah 3:24. Dr Vance explains that the word itself indicates that it is a woman’s garment for the midriff, as the associated term **“girdle”** shows, whether this term is taken to mean ‘belt’ or ‘corset,’ according to the dictionary meanings. **“Stomacher”** occurs once in the AV1611.

**“Wot”** Romans 11:2. The expressions **“I wot not”** and **“we wot not”** appear 6 times in the AV1611 and each time the meaning ‘know’ or ‘knows’ is clear, as both the dictionary and Dr Vance confirm.

**“Wist”** Acts 12:9. **“Wot”** is the present tense of the verb **“wit.”** **“Wist”** is the past tense and therefore means ‘knew.’ Dr Vance and the dictionary outline the verb tenses but the expression **“wist not”** occurs 9 times in the AV1611, together with the phrase **“wist ye not”** in Luke 2:49, each occasion indicating that the meaning of the expression is ‘knew not.’

**“Withs”** Judges 16:7. White and Palmer forgot to inform the reader that these are **“green withs”** and therefore ‘flexible branches’ as the dictionary indicates, as the plural of ‘withe.’ Dr Vance confirms this meaning. This word occurs only 3 times in the AV1611, each time in Judges 16. Like White’s other ‘unfamiliar’ terms in the AV1611, it therefore does not pose a serious problem for the conscientious reader of scripture.

**“Wont”** Daniel 3:19. **“Wont”** is not an ‘archaic’ word, as Dr Vance explains. The term occurs 9 times in an AV1611 and each time, the meaning is clearly ‘used to’ or ‘accustomed to.’ Both Dr Vance and the dictionary give this meaning of **“wont,”** which as a noun retains the meaning ‘habit’ or ‘custom’ to this day, e.g. ‘as is his wont.’ Once again, White and Palmer display their ignorance of both English and the scripture.

**“Suretiship”** Proverbs 11:15. **“Suretiship”** occurs once in the AV1611. The meaning in the context is **“a pledge,”** given in Proverbs 20:16, 27:13 as the meaning of the associated, contemporary word **“surety,”** as also the dictionary indicates.

**“Sackbut”** Daniel 3:5. This is a term for a musical instrument and occurs only 4 times in the AV1611, Daniel 3:5, 7, 10, 15. Dr Vance indicates it is ‘a Medieval wind instrument’ although the dictionary refers to it as ‘a trombone.’ However, Daniel 3:5 lists 3 stringed instruments, **“harp...psaltery, dulcimer”** and 2 instruments readily identified as wind instruments, **“cornet, flute.”** The **“sackbut”** is clearly not a percussion instrument such as a **“tabret”** –see later – and so its identity as a third wind instrument to balance the trio of stringed instruments could readily be guessed at. If this explanation seems speculative, Dr Vance indicates that the modern alternatives to **“sackbut”** are either no more easily understood, e.g. **“trigon”** NASV or are incorrect, **“lyre”** NIV, NKJV.

**“The scall”** Leviticus 13:30. **“The scall”** is clearly a skin blemish, as Dr Vance and the dictionary indicate. Dr Vance indicates further that the term is still found in medical dictionaries. The word occurs 14 times in the AV1611, 13 in Leviticus 13 and in Leviticus 14:54. These references show that term refers to a plague in the skin, associated with leprosy.

**“Scrabbled”** 1 Samuel 21:13. **“Scrabbled”** is not an archaic word and it occurs only once in the AV1611. White and Palmer are again showing their ignorance of English and their prejudice against the Holy Bible. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘scratch,’ which is apparent from the verse as David was clearly making random marks on the woodwork to simulate derangement.

**“Roller”** Ezekiel 30:21. This word occurs only once in an AV1611. The modern versions change it but are not agreed on what the replacement term should be. The NASV has **“bandage”** but the NIV, NKJV have **“splint.”** **“Splint”** may be a more familiar term than **“roller”** but of itself doesn’t convey its essential meaning. As the dictionary and the word itself indicate, a roller is a cylindrical rod that in the verse would be used (as a splint) to help set and strengthen a broken arm.

**“Muffler”** Isaiah 3:19. **“Muffler(s)”** is yet another word that occurs only once in the AV1611. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘scarf,’ which is apparent from the very next verse that refers to **“bonnets,”** which is an associated form of headgear. ‘Scarf’ is the correct meaning because such a garment is intended to ‘muffle’ the effects of wind and cold. The NIV, NASV, NKJV change the word to **“veils”** and are therefore united in error.

**“Froward”** 1 Peter 2:18. **“Froward”** and related words occur 25 times in the AV1611. This is an appreciable number of occurrences but the meaning of the word is clear from many of them. The first occurrence is in Deuteronomy 32:20, where the **“froward”** are those that are not trusting in the Lord. Proverbs 2:15 shows that the **“froward”** are those **“whose ways are crooked.”** Other occurrences show that to be **“froward”** is to be **“wicked”** Psalm 101:4, **“evil”** Proverbs 2:12 and **“perverse”** Proverbs 4:24. The dictionary meaning is ‘persistent in error’ or ‘wayward’ and Dr Vance includes with these meanings, ‘turned away from...what is demanded or reasonable.’ Dr Vance indicates that

‘froward’ is the opposite of ‘toward,’ as in ‘to and fro.’ All these meanings match the scriptural use of the word, which, as shown, is apparent from the verses where it occurs.

**“Brigandine”** Jeremiah 46:4. This word, with its plural form, occurs twice in the AV1611 and clearly refers to a form of body armour that is **“put on.”** Dr Vance states that the word means ‘armour for a brigand,’ i.e. a ‘irregular soldier’ or ‘robber,’ which is the dictionary meaning for ‘brigand.’ Both occurrences of the word suggest a hastily assembled defence, for which many defenders may have only the most basic armour, such as would be worn by a ‘brigand.’

**“Amerce”** Deuteronomy 22:19. **“Amerce”** occurs only once in the AV1611. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘to fine.’ This meaning emerges from the verse, which describes the offender as deprived of mercy, i.e. ‘a-merced,’ in that he is not pardoned but punished. This meaning is apparent from the preceding verse.

**“And the elders of that city shall take that man and chastise him”** Deuteronomy 22:18.

Dr Vance indicates that the modern versions use the term **“fine”** but adds that **“amerce”** remains in common legal use to this day. Note that the modern alteration of **“amerce”** to **“fine”** removes the meaning of ‘deprived of mercy’ and is therefore inferior.

**“Blains”** Exodus 9:9. This word occurs but twice in the AV1611. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘an inflammation on the skin’ or ‘pustule,’ which is the same meaning as indicated by the scripture, which associates **“blains”** with **“a boil breaking forth.”**

**“Crookbackt”** Leviticus 21:20. This is another word that occurs once in the AV1611. It means what it says, ‘hunchback,’ according to the dictionary meaning. White and Palmer may not be aware of Shakespeare’s *Henry VI, Part 3, Act 1, Scene 4* and the enduring reference<sup>189</sup> to **“valiant crook-back prodigy, Dicky,”** Richard, Duke of Gloucester, 1452-1485, who later became King Richard III. Richard was said to be a hunchback but may have suffered only from a mild deformity.

**“Descry”** Judges 1:23. **“Descry”** also appears only once in the AV1611. Dr Vance and the dictionary indicate that the meaning is to ‘map out’ or ‘describe,’ which word is indicated by the form of the word **“descry.”** As Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>67 p 10</sup> shows, this meaning is apparent in verse 24, where the men **“sent to descry Bethel”** are **“spies.”**

**“Fanners”** Jeremiah 51:2. The verse indicates that **“fanners”** are winnowers who **“fan”** using a winnowing fork, as the 8 occurrences of **“fan”** in the AV1611 show. See for example, Isaiah 30:24, 41:16. **“Fanners”** occurs once. Both Dr Vance and the dictionary confirm this meaning.

**“Felloes”** 1 Kings 7:33. This word, too, occurs once in an AV1611. Both Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘parts of a wheel rim.’ The meaning of this word is apparent from considering the component parts of a wheel that the verse describes, even if by a process of elimination.

**“Glede”** Deuteronomy 14:13. **“Glede”** also occurs only once in an AV1611. It clearly refers to a bird of prey. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* does not contain this word but Dr Vance shows that, as the name implies, the **“glede”** is a gliding bird of prey, ‘a buzzard or a kite,’ most likely the former because **“the kite”** is mentioned specifically in Deuteronomy 14:13.

**“Glistering”** Luke 9:29. This word occurs twice in an AV1611. It clearly means ‘shining with light,’ including reflected light as in 1 Chronicles 29:2. Both Dr Vance and the

dictionary give this meaning, which is certainly apparent from the parallel passages, Matthew 17:2 *“white as the light”* and Mark 9:3 *“shining, exceeding white.”*

*“Habergeon”* Job 41:26. This word occurs 5 times in the AV1611 and therefore, like most of the words in this list, will not be encountered often. Both Dr Vance and the dictionary state that it refers to ‘a sleeveless coat,’ which, as they both indicate, could be composed of protective armour, such as mail. The first 2 occurrences of the word in scripture, Exodus 28:32, 39:23, suggest this meaning of ‘a sleeveless coat.’ The final reference, Job 41:26, shows therefore that no earthly protection is proof against the Devil, which is why the believer needs *“the shield of faith”* Ephesians 6:16 – and the marginal note for Job 41:6 indicates that a *“habergeon”* is ‘a breastplate,’ which is a possible meaning. Why didn’t White therefore refer to this verse and note, given that he considers marginal references<sup>3 p 77</sup> in the AV1611 to be very important? See Will Kinney’s comments below.

*“Implead”* Acts 19:38. *“Implead”* is yet another word that occurs only once in the AV1611. Dr Vance and the dictionary show that it means to ‘sue,’ ‘prosecute’ or ‘take proceedings against’ and Dr Vance states that the word is still a legal term. The verse itself indicates that the word refers to court proceedings, where the respective parties would ‘plead against’ each other.

*“Neesing(s)”* Job 41:18. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* does not contain this term but Dr Vance likens the word to the modern term ‘sneeze,’ which would be correct in the context. Essentially the word refers to heavy exhalations, which *“kindleth coals”* such that *“a flame goeth out of his mouth”* Job 41:21, so again the AV1611 is self-interpreting. The passage is describing the Devil in his essential form<sup>190</sup> *“the great dragon...that old serpent”* Revelation 12:9, by which he is ‘fire-breathing.’ See Will Kinney’s comments below.

*“Neesing(s)”* is another word that occurs only once in the AV1611.

*“Nitre”* Proverbs 25:20. This word occurs twice in the AV1611. Dr Vance states that *“nitre”* is a ‘cleansing agent,’ which is also apparent from Proverbs 25:20, where *“nitre”* or as the dictionary indicates, ‘saltpetre,’ i.e. sodium nitrate, is mixed with *“vinegar”* or acetic acid. The word’s other occurrence in the AV1611, Jeremiah 2:22, likewise shows that it is a cleansing agent.

*“For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord GOD.”*

*“Tabret”* Genesis 31:27. Dr Vance states that a *“tabret”* is ‘a small drum.’ *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* does not explicitly contain the word *“tabret”* but it does list ‘tabor,’ which also means ‘a small drum,’ from which the meaning of *“tabret”* could be guessed. *“Tabret”* occurs 9 times in the AV1611 in either the singular or plural form, 3 times in association with *“pipe”* 1 Samuel 10:5, Isaiah 5:12, Ezekiel 28:13. These verses indicate that a *“tabret”* is a drum, because pipe and drum combinations are well known and as the dictionary indicates, a ‘tabor’ (tabret) is often used to accompany a pipe.

The related word *“tabering”* in the AV1611 also shows that a *“tabret”* is a drum.

*“And Huzzab shall be led away captive, she shall be brought up, and her maids shall lead her as with the voice of doves, tabering upon their breasts”* Nahum 2:7.

*“Wen”* Leviticus 22:22. *“Wen”* occurs only once in the AV1611 and is not archaic because Dr Vance notes that the word is still retained in medical dictionaries. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘a tumor’ or ‘wart’ or ‘cyst.’ Leviticus 22:22 in-

cludes the words “*scurvy*” and “*scabbed*” and therefore shows that a “*wen*” is a type of skin blemish. A “*wen*” is apparently not a “*blain*” – see above – which tends to leave warts or similar protuberances as the only possible meanings for the word.

White alludes to readings compiled by Jack Lewis, author of *The English Bible* from KJV to NIV “*that leave one confused at first glance.*”

White and Lewis should do more than merely glance at the scriptures. They should “*search*” them, John 5:39.

**“Yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; If thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; Then shalt thou understand the fear of the LORD, and find the knowledge of God”** Proverbs 2:3-5.

Lewis’s objections to the Holy Bible are as follows.

“*On a smoke*” Exodus 19:18. The mountain was like “*a furnace...because the LORD descended upon it in fire.*” If the mountain was ‘afire’ as it was, then most readers would understand that it was ‘a smoke’ or “*on a smoke,*” though evidently neither White nor Lewis. The expression “*on a smoke*” occurs once in the AV1611.

“*Leasing*” Psalm 5:6. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as ‘lying.’ What do White and Lewis think it means, with the word “*deceitful*” in the very verse that they are quoting, the second of the only two occasions when the word appears in the AV1611? See Will Kinney’s comments below.

“*Outlandish women*” Nehemiah 13:26. The word “*outlandish*” also occurs only once in the AV1611. Dr Vance gives the meaning in the context as ‘foreign’ and the dictionary states ‘foreign looking.’ Moreover, as Dr Vance indicates, the word is not ‘archaic.’

Even without these helps, the meaning is clear from Nehemiah 13:23, which refers to “*wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab,*” i.e. women from ‘outside the land,’ who are also described in the very next verse as “*strange wives*” i.e. ‘strange to the land.’ The same meaning is clear from 1 Kings 11:1 that describes the situation to which Nehemiah is referring, although this verse likewise appears to be unintelligible to White and Lewis. See below.

**“But king Solomon loved many strange women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites.”**

“*Strange women*” 1 Kings 11:1. White and Lewis appear unable to compare “*spiritual things with spiritual*” 1 Corinthians 2:13b. “*Strange women*” in the context refers to ‘women who are strange to the land,’ i.e. ‘strangers.’ See above and the following.

**“Then she fell on her face, and bowed herself to the ground, and said unto him, Why have I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldst take knowledge of me, seeing I am a stranger?”** Ruth 2:10.

The expression occurs but 3 times in the AV1611. The remaining 2 occurrences, Proverbs 22:14, 23:33, ironically written by Solomon, include the evil connotation that now attaches to the expression.

“*The ships of Tarshish did sing of thee*” Ezekiel 27:25. The statement, which occurs once in the AV1611, is obviously figurative and most likely refers to members of the ships’ crews verbally proclaiming the quality of Tyre’s wares in her own local marketplace, much as market traders often do today, or like singing TV commercials.

The NIV, NASV, NKJV substitute the mundane reading, “*were the carriers of your merchandise*” or similar but retain the AV1611’s figurative expression “*clap their hands*” in Psalm 98:8, Isaiah 55:12. White and Lewis are therefore both guilty of being ‘inconsistent’ with respect to Ezekiel 27:25 in the AV1611 and resorting to a ‘double standard.’

“*To wit*” 2 Corinthians 8:1. Dr Vance states that this expression occurs 17 times in an AV1611 when used in an introductory sense, e.g. Joshua 17:1, 2 Corinthians 5:19 but affirms that it is still in common use. Its biblical usage is therefore not excessive. The dictionary and Dr Vance give the meaning of the expression in the introductory sense as ‘that is to say’ or ‘namely.’ “*To wit*” clearly refers to a thing that is to be known, as shown in Joshua 17:1, 1 Kings 2:32, 2 Corinthians 5:19 etc. See also comments above on “*wot*” and “*wist*.”

Will Kinney<sup>191</sup> comments on “*neesings*,” “*habergeons*” and “*leasing*” as follows.

*“Neesings, Habergeons, and leasing*

*“Job 41:18 “By his neesings a light doth shine”...*

*“Now let’s look at a couple of these words so often criticized in the King James Bible. Both are found in the 41st chapter of the book of Job.*

*“One of the words that is usually included on these lists is “neesings”. In the book of Job chapter 41 God is describing a mighty creature called leviathan...the King James Bible says: “By his neesings a light doth shine, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning”...*

*“Most modern versions like the RSV, NKJV, NASB, NIV, ESV have changed this to “sneezings”. The NKJV says: “His sneezings flash forth light, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning.” But is this correct?...*

*“There is a word that is translated as “sneeze” and it is different from the word found in Job 41:18. The word translated as sneeze is in 2 Kings 4:35 where Elisha was used of God to raise a child from the dead. Elisha prayed to the LORD for the life of the Shunammite woman’s son. He then stretched himself upon the little boy “and the child SNEEZED seven times, and the child opened his eyes.”*

*“Most dictionaries tell us that to “neese” is the same thing as to “sneeze”, but there does seem to be a difference in meaning. The King James Bible has the correct word, neesings, which means to blow air out through the nose. It is not quite the same thing as sneezing.*

*“The ATS Bible Dictionary says of the word “neesing” that it is “used in Job 41:18 to describe the violent breathing of the enraged leviathan, or crocodile.” I don’t believe this animal was a crocodile, but I think they have the correct idea that the word neesing implies the blowing out of air through the nose.*

*“<http://home.att.net/~kc5seo/dictionaryn.htm>*

*“Another online dictionary says: “Neesing is breathing heavily, emitting harsh, snorting sounds - Job 41:18...”*

*“Even Adam Clarke, who often “corrects” the Bible with his own thoughts has this to say: “By his neesings a light doth shine. It is very likely that this may be taken literally. When he spurts up the water out of his nostrils, the drops form a sort of iris or rainbow.”*

*“Notice he does not change the word “neesings” and he refers to it as spurting water out of his nostrils, rather than “sneezing”.*

*“You see, instead of just assuming that nasty ol’ King James Bible is all wrong and out-dated with its “archaic” words, we can actually learn a great deal more by studying our own English language. The King James translators were not dummies. More importantly, I and thousands of other Christians firmly believe they were providentially guided by the hand of Almighty God to produce the greatest Bible ever printed. The Lord Jesus said “By their fruits ye shall know them.”*

*“Habergeon*

*“The meaning of the word.*

*“Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary 10th edition - Habergeon: a medieval jacket of mail shorter than a hauberk.*

*Compact Oxford English Dictionary - Habergeon: a sleeveless coat of mail or scale armour [also in The Concise Oxford Dictionary].*

*“American Heritage Dictionary 2000 - Habergeon: a sleeveless coat of mail.*

*“None of these modern dictionaries even list the word habergeon as being archaic. Neither is “coat of mail” archaic, yet these have not been used in battle for a couple of centuries now.*

*“Job 41:26*

*“The King James Bible -”The sword of him that layeth at him cannot hold: the spear, the dart, nor the HABERGEON.”*

*“The Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary merely says: habergeon - coat of mail.*

*“Adam Clarke remarks: “Habergeon - armour for the head, neck and breast.”*

*“Matthew Henry comments: “The defensive weapons which men use when they engage with the leviathan, as the habergeon, or breast-plate, often serve men no more than their offensive weapons.”*

*“Easton’s Bible Dictionary says: “Habergeon is an Old English word for breastplate. In Job 41:26 (Heb. shiryah) it is properly a “coat of mail”*

*“Not only does the King James Bible read “habergeon” but so also do the Geneva Bible 1587, Webster’s 1833 translation, and the 1936 Hebrew Publication Society’s translation.*

*“Some versions have BREASTPLATE. These include Coverdale 1535, the Bishop’s Bible 1568, the 1950 Douay Version...”*

*“But the meaning becomes drastically changed in these following versions...”*

*NKJV, RSV, NASB, ESV, NIV - “Nor the spear, the dart or the JAVELIN.”*

*“I would much rather have the true Holy Bible that gives me the correct meaning of a verse even though it uses a word with which I am not familiar and need to learn (i.e. habergeon) than to use one of these updated, modern versions (NKJV, NIV, NASB) that misses the correct meaning, even though it is easier to read. How about you?...”*

*“Leasing*

*“Psalm 5:6 “Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing.”*

*“The King James Bible critics love to pounce on this verse because of the use of the word “leasing”. They tell us “leasing” is an archaic word and imply or state outright that we*



should abandon the King James Bible and start using some modern version like the NASB, NIV or the NKJV...

*“The word leasing is indeed an archaic word; it simply means falsehood, deception, or lying. Heaven forbid that we should have to learn the meaning of an unfamiliar English word! There are scores of unfamiliar words found in the modern versions too, besides the crucial fact that they are based on the wrong underlying texts.*

*“Let’s first look at the meaning of the word “leasing”...The word leasing is found only twice in the KJB - once in Psalm 4:2 and again in Psalm 5:6...The King James Bible translated this same Hebrew word kah-zahv, as “lies” 23 times, lying 2, leasing 2, deceitful 1, false 1, and liar 1 time.*

*“Leasing*

*“Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary 1996, 1998*

*““Leasing n. [Anglo Saxon. leásung, fr. leás loose, false, deceitful. The act of lying; falsehood; a lie or lies. [Archaic]...”*

*“International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*

*““LEASING - lez’- ing “to devise,” “to fabricate,” hence, “to lie”; occurs but twice in the King James Version; the Hebrew word is translated “liars” (Ps 116:11); “lie” or deceive (Job 6:28)): The idea of treachery, lying, and deceit, lies at the root of this word.”*

*“King James Bible - Psalm 4:2*

*““O ye sons of men, how long will ye turn my glory into shame? how long will ye love vanity, and SEEK AFTER LEASING? Selah”.*

*“Coverdale 1535 - “and seek after LIES”*

*“Bishop’s Bible 1568 –“ye seeke after lyes”*

*“Geneva Bible 1587 - “ and seeking lyes?”*

*“King James Bible - Psalm 5:6*

*““Thou shalt destroy THEM THAT SPEAK LEASING: the LORD will abhor the bloody and deceitful man.”*

*“Coverdale 1535 - “Thou destroyest THE LYERS: the LORDE abhorreth the bloude thurstie and disceatfull.”*

*“Bishops’ Bible 1568 - “Thou wilt destroy THEM THAT MAKE A LYE: God wyll abhorre both the bloodthirstie and deceitfull man.”*

*“Geneva Bible -”Thou shalt destroy THEM THAT SPEAK LYES: the Lorde will abhorre the bloodie man and deceitfull.”*

*“Even the older English Bible versions had the word “lies” in these two places in Psalm 4:2 and 5:6. It seems obvious that the King James translators made a deliberate choice to include the older English word “leasing” in these two verses. It was not an accident nor were they following the reading of older English Bibles.”*

As indicated, the AV1611 has **“deceitful”** in Psalm 5:6, together with **“leasing,”** thereby defining this unusual term, by means of its own built-in dictionary. See remarks above on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s works<sup>39</sup> Chapters 1-3, 67. Noting Kinney’s remarks, it may be that the King’s men chose **“leasing”** in these references to convey a heart-attitude of deceit, Jeremiah 17:9, more fundamental than simply telling lies.

***“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?”***

James White is too lazy to use a dictionary and complains, his emphasis, “*Why make reading the Scriptures a laborious task [by consulting a dictionary] when simply translating them into our modern tongue would do just as well?...there is no need to add **unnecessary** ambiguity to the scriptural texts. Utilizing terms that are no longer a part of our language has no place in making the Scriptures available to all people.*”

White’s statement is the height of hypocrisy. James White<sup>3 p 7</sup> has urged “*Christians to purchase and use multiple translations of the Bible [unspecified]...to get a firm grasp upon the meaning of any passage.*” His statement has particular reference to “*studying the [unspecified] bible*” but applies equally to reading the scriptures, which is an essential part of bible study.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s rebuke<sup>96 p 92-3</sup> applies as well, if White is so concerned about “*making the Scriptures available to all people.*” See also remarks in **Chapter 5**.

*“It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.”*

Dr Vance<sup>124</sup> has shown that not only are many supposedly ‘archaic’ AV1611 words found in contemporary publications, in a non-archaic context but modern versions such as the NIV, NASV, NKJV, NRSV introduce hundreds of difficult words to replace the corresponding simpler words of the AV1611. Acquisition of “*multiple translations,*” therefore, achieves nothing.

But White<sup>3 p 238</sup> maintains, “*The AV is the result of human effort, human skill, human work,*” i.e. it is not the word of God, even though his information “*is not meant to “bash” the KJV.*” Continuing with his ‘light touch’ towards the Holy Bible, White declares that, “*The presence of errors and mishaps in the text of the KJV is an insurmountable obstacle for those who wish to proclaim the KJV inspired, inerrant and infallible.*”

Thus far, and it will be found to be so for the rest of his book, White has not produced a single such “*insurmountable obstacle.*” Neither has he identified *any* volume between two covers that he would describe as “*the...inspired, inerrant and infallible*” word of God.

As Will Kinney has rightly said of White, Kutilek, Carson, Lewis et alia in his remarks on “**God save the king,**” see above, “*the only “infallible bible” they have exists solely in their minds and imaginations.*” Will Kinney rightly alludes to Judges 21:25. This passage applies equally to what is nominally “**an holy nation**” 1 Peter 2:9 but which has like Joab found “**the king’s word...abominable**” 1 Chronicles 21:6.

***“In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes.”***

White has attacked a total of 62 words or expressions in the AV1611 in the last part of this chapter that he judges to be “*not readily understandable to people today.*”

Inspection of these terms reveals that the biblical meanings of all the supposedly unfamiliar terms except 4, “*ceiled*,” “*glede*,” “*neesings*” and “*tabret*” may be found in an ordinary dictionary such as *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, provided that the reader, unlike White, is not too lazy to use one. Other comprehensive helps are available, e.g. Dr Vance’s<sup>124</sup> compilation but as this author’s study has confirmed, the AV1611 is consistently self-interpreting, according to its own built-in dictionary, as explained by Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39</sup>. So neither White nor any other bible critic has any reasonable grounds for complaint against the Holy Bible about its language.

Furthermore, Dr Vance has also shown that difficult words that would require an ordinary reader to consult a dictionary occur repeatedly in the most popular modern versions, NIV, NASV, NRSV, NKJV and that a great many supposedly ‘archaic’ or difficult words in the AV1611 are still in modern use, according to their biblical meanings, in secular literature.

Many of the terms that White objects to as “*not readily understandable to people today*” occur rarely in the AV1611 and therefore pose no serious problem to the ordinary reader.

25 of the 62 words or expressions to which White objects, occur only once in the AV1611, or 40%.

**“Road,” “feble-minded,” “chambering,” “champaign,” “collops,” “cotes,” “hoised,” “wimples,” “stomacher,” “suretiship,” “scrabbled,” “roller,” “muffler,” “amerce,” “crookbackt,” “descry,” “fanners,” “felloes,” “glede,” “implead,” “neesing(s),” “wen,” “on a smoke,” “outlandish,” “the ships...did sing.”**

19 of the 62 words or expressions to which White objects, occur 4 or more times in the AV1611, or 31%. Several of these occur less than 10 times.

**“Let, letteth,” “prevent,” “communicate, communicated,” “knit,” “wealth,” “degree,” “quick, quicken, quickeneth,” “charger,” “cieled, (ceiled),” “covert,” “wot,” “wist,” “wont,” “sackbut,” “scall,” “forward,” “habergeon,” “tabret,” “to wit.”**

In sum, nearly 7 out of 10 words or expressions to which White objects occur 3 times or less in the AV1611. Once again, White has revealed that he has a very weak case against the AV1611.

This part of the study concludes with summary tables, similar to those in the previous chapter, showing the strength of agreement between the AV1611 and pre-1611 bibles with respect to White’s so-called ‘problem’ texts and the equivalent agreement between White’s ‘preferred’ translations, NASV, NIV and the corrupt bibles of Rome and Watchtower, JB, NWT.

**Table 4**  
**Comparison of ‘Problem’ Passages, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles**

<b>Verse</b>	<b>Wycliffe<sup>46</sup></b>	<b>Tyndale<sup>47</sup></b>	<b>Geneva<sup>49</sup></b>	<b>Bishops<sup>138</sup></b>	<b>AV1611</b>
Gen. 50:20	<i>thought, turned</i>	<i>thought, turned<sup>note 2</sup></i>	<i>thought, dis-posed</i>	<i>thought, turned</i>	<b><i>thought, meant</i></b>
1 Sam. 10:24	<i>live the king</i>	<i>God save the new king<sup>note 2</sup></i>	<i>God save the king</i>	<i>God save the king</i>	<b><i>God save the king</i></b>
2 Sam. 8:18	<i>priests</i>	<i>priests<sup>note 2</sup></i>	<i>chief rulers</i>	<i>chief rulers</i>	<b><i>rulers</i></b>
1 Ki. 10:28	<i>Coa, Coa</i>	<i>Reua, Reua<sup>note 2</sup></i>	<i>fine linen, linen</i>	<i>fine linen, linen</i>	<b><i>linen yarn, linen yarn</i></b>
1 Chr. 5:26	<i>and...Tilgath pilneser</i>	<i>and...Tilgath pilneser<sup>note 2</sup></i>	<i>and...Tilgath pilneser</i>	<i>and...Tilgath pilneser</i>	<b><i>and...Tilgat hpilneser</i></b>
Isaiah 65:11	<i>fortune, OMIT</i>	<i>fortune, treasure<sup>note 2</sup></i>	<i>multitude, number</i>	<i>Jupiter, planets</i>	<b><i>troop, number</i></b>
Amos 4:4	<i>the third day</i>	<i>the third day<sup>note 2</sup></i>	<i>three years</i>	<i>three years</i>	<b><i>three years</i></b>
Matt. 19:18	<i>manslaying</i>	<i>kill</i>	<i>kill</i>	<i>murder</i>	<b><i>murder</i></b>
Matt. 27:44	<i>upbraided Him of the same thing</i>	<i>cast in his teeth</i>	<i>cast in his teeth</i>	<i>cast the same in his teeth</i>	<b><i>cast the same in his teeth</i></b>
Mark 6:20	<i>kept</i>	<i>gave him reverence</i>	<i>reverenced</i>	<i>gave him reverence</i>	<b><i>observed</i></b>
Mark 9:18	<i>waxes dry</i>	<i>pineth away</i>	<i>pineth away</i>	<i>pineth away</i>	<b><i>pineth away</i></b>
Luke 18:12	<i>have in possession</i>	<i>possess</i>	<i>possess</i>	<i>possess</i>	<b><i>possess</i></b>
Acts 5:30	<i>hanging in a tree</i>	<i>slew and hanged</i>	<i>slew and hanged</i>	<i>slew and hanged</i>	<b><i>slew and hanged</i></b>
Acts 7:45	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<b><i>Jesus</i></b>
Acts 12:4	<i>pask</i>	<i>easter</i>	<i>Passover</i>	<i>Easter</i>	<b><i>Easter</i></b>
Acts 19:2	<i>whether, Ghost</i>	<i>since, Ghost</i>	<i>since, Ghost</i>	<i>since, Ghost</i>	<b><i>since, Ghost</i></b>
Acts 22:9a	<b>OMIT</b>	<i>and were afraid</i>	<i>and were afraid</i>	<i>and were afraid</i>	<b><i>and were afraid</i></b>
Acts 22:9b	<i>heard not</i>	<i>heard not</i>	<i>heard not</i>	<i>heard not</i>	<b><i>heard not</i></b>
Rom. 3:4 +	<i>God forbid</i>	<i>God forbid</i>	<i>God forbid</i>	<i>God forbid</i>	<b><i>God forbid</i></b>
Rom. 8:16	<i>ilk spirit</i>	<i>same spirit</i>	<i>same spirit</i>	<i>same spirit</i>	<b><i>Spirit itself</i></b>
Rom. 8:26	<i>ilk spirit</i>	<i>spirit</i>	<i>spirit itself</i>	<i>spirit</i>	<b><i>Spirit itself</i></b>
Rom. 13:9a	<i>slay</i>	<i>kill</i>	<i>kill</i>	<i>kill</i>	<b><i>kill</i></b>

**Table 4, Continued**  
**Comparison of ‘Problem’ Verses, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles**

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Rom. 13:9b	<i>Thou shalt not see false witnessing</i>	<i>Thou shalt not bear false witness</i>	<i>Thou shalt not bear false witness</i>	<i>Thou shalt not bear false witness</i>	<b><i>Thou shalt not bear false witness</i></b>
1 Cor. 4:4	<i>nothing over trowing to myself</i>	<i>nought by myself</i>	<i>nothing by myself</i>	<i>nothing by myself</i>	<b><i>nothing by myself</i></b>
Heb. 4:8	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<b><i>Jesus</i></b>
Heb. 9:7	<i>the people’s [ignorance]</i>	<i>ignorance of the people</i>	<i>ignorance of the people</i>	<i>ignorance of the people</i>	<b><i>errors of the people</i></b>
Heb. 10:23	<i>hope</i>	<i>hope</i>	<i>hope</i>	<i>hope</i>	<b><i>faith</i></b>
James 3:2	<i>all we offend</i>	<i>we sin all</i>	<i>we sin all</i>	<i>we sin all</i>	<b><i>we offend all</i></b>
With AV	<b>21</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>37</b>
% with AV	<b>57</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes:

1. Spelling is as in the AV1611, except where the wording differs appreciably.
2. Coverdale’s Bible is used instead of Tyndale’s for the 7 Old Testament references listed.
3. Readings that differ essentially from the AV1611 are shaded, likewise omissions.
4. White lists 10 verses in Romans that contain the expression “***God forbid.***” Romans 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11. Although the expression occurs elsewhere in the AV1611, only these 10 have been used for the overall total.
5. *Ilk* = *same* in Wycliffe’s Bible, Romans 8:16, 26.

Table 4 contains 37 passages of scripture, based on 35 verses in total that James White insists are “*problems in the KJV,*” including the 10 references in Romans to the expression “***God forbid.***” These passages generate a total of 148 readings for the pre-1611 bibles. 40 readings in the pre-1611 bibles depart from the AV1611.

Table 4 therefore shows a 73% agreement, on average, between the pre-1611 bibles and the AV1611. These figures largely reflect the influence on the results of Wycliffe’s and Tyndale’s/Coverdale’s bibles, which agree with the AV1611 in 21 and 25 of the 37 references respectively, or 57% and 68%. The Geneva and Bishops’ bibles each agree with the AV1611 in 31 of the 37 passages or 84%.

Although this level of agreement is less than that for Table 2 – see previous chapter - the bibles that God used to prepare and sustain the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation nevertheless show considerable support for the AV1611 that clearly increased as the English Reformation progressed.

**Table 5**  
**Comparison of ‘Problem’ Passages, AV1611 and Post-1611 Bibles**

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
Gen. 50:20	<i>intended, intended</i>	<i>meant, meant</i>	<i>planned, design</i>	<i>in mind, in mind</i>	<i>thought, meant</i>
1 Sam. 10:24	<i>Long live the king</i>	<i>Long live the king</i>	<i>Long live the king</i>	<i>Let the king live</i>	<b>God save the king</b>
2 Sam. 8:18	<i>royal advisers</i>	<i>ministers</i>	<i>priests</i>	<i>priests</i>	<i>rulers</i>
1 Ki. 10:28	<i>Kue, Kue</i>	<i>Kue, Kue</i>	<i>Cilicia, Cilicia*</i>	OMIT, <i>horse drove</i>	<i>linen yarn, linen yarn</i>
1 Chr. 5:26	<i>that is, Tilgath-Pileser</i>	<i>even... Tilgathpilneser</i>	<i>and of Tilgathpileser</i>	<i>even... Tilgathpilne-ser</i>	<i>and... Tilgathpilneser</i>
Isaiah 65:11	<i>Fortune, Destiny</i>	<i>Fortune, Destiny</i>	<i>Gad, Meni*</i>	<i>god of Luck, god of Destiny</i>	<i>troop, number</i>
Amos 4:4	<i>three years</i>	<i>three days</i>	<i>third day*</i>	<i>third day</i>	<i>three years</i>
Matt. 19:18	<i>murder</i>	<i>murder</i>	<i>kill</i>	<i>murder</i>	<i>murder</i>
Matt. 27:44	<i>heaped insults on him</i>	<i>insulting Him with the same words</i>	<i>taunted him in the same way*</i>	<i>began reproaching him</i>	<i>cast the same in his teeth</i>
Mark 6:20	<i>protected him</i>	<i>kept him safe</i>	<i>gave him his protection*</i>	<i>keeping him safe</i>	<i>observed</i>
Mark 9:18	<i>becomes rigid</i>	<i>stiffens out</i>	<i>goes rigid</i>	<i>loses his strength</i>	<i>pineth away</i>
Luke 18:12	<i>get</i>	<i>get</i>	<i>get</i>	<i>acquire</i>	<i>possess</i>
Acts 5:30	<i>you had killed by hanging</i>	<i>put to death by hanging</i>	<i>had him executed by hanging*</i>	<i>you slew, hanging him</i>	<i>slew and hanged</i>
Acts 7:45	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<b>Jesus</b>
Acts 12:4	<i>Passover</i>	<i>Passover</i>	<i>Passover*</i>	<i>passover</i>	<b>Easter</b>
Acts 19:2	<i>when, Spirit</i>	<i>when, Spirit</i>	<i>when, Spirit</i>	<i>when, spirit</i>	<i>since, Ghost</i>
Acts 22:9a	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>and were afraid</i>
Acts 22:9b	<i>did not understand</i>	<i>did not understand</i>	<i>did not hear</i>	<i>did not hear</i>	<i>heard not</i>

**Table 5, Continued**  
**Comparison of ‘Problem’ Verses, AV1611 and New Bibles**

<b>Verse</b>	<b>NIV</b>	<b>NASV</b>	<b>JB*</b>	<b>NWT</b>	<b>AV1611</b>
Rom. 3:4 +	<i>Not at all, Certainly not, By no means</i>	<i>May it never be</i>	<i>absurd, not at all, of course not, obviously not</i>	<i>Never may that happen, Never may that become so</i>	<b>God forbid</b>
Rom. 8:16	<i>Spirit Him- self</i>	<i>Spirit himself</i>	<i>Spirit him- self*</i>	<i>spirit itself</i>	<b>Spirit itself</b>
Rom. 8:26	<i>Spirit Him- self</i>	<i>Spirit himself</i>	<i>Spirit him- self*</i>	<i>spirit itself</i>	<b>Spirit itself</b>
Rom. 13:9a	<i>murder</i>	<i>murder</i>	<i>kill</i>	<i>murder</i>	<b>kill</b>
Rom. 13:9b	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<b>Thou shalt not bear false witness</b>
1 Cor. 4:4	<i>my con- science is clear</i>	<i>nothing against my- self</i>	<i>my con- science does not reproach me*</i>	<i>not con- scious of anything against my- self</i>	<b>nothing by myself</b>
Heb. 4:8	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Joshua</i>	<b>Jesus</b>
Heb. 9:7	<i>sins... commi- tted in igno- rance</i>	<i>sins... commi- tted in igno- rance</i>	<i>people’s [faults] DR, JR igno- rance</i>	<i>sins of igno- rance</i>	<b>errors of the people</b>
Heb. 10:23	<i>hope</i>	<i>hope</i>	<i>hope*</i>	<i>hope</i>	<b>faith</b>
James 3:2	<i>all stumble</i>	<i>all stumble</i>	<i>every- one... does wrong*</i>	<i>all stumble</i>	<b>we offend all</b>
With AV	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4/23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>37</b>
% with AV	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11/62</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>

## Notes:

1. An asterisk\* indicates agreement of the DR, JR (Challoner’s Revision, 1749-52) with the JB against the AV1611, although the actual wording may differ slightly between the Catholic versions. Otherwise, except for Hebrews 9:7, the DR, JR agrees with the AV1611.
2. NIV, NASV, JB, NWT readings that agree with the AV1611 are shaded.

3. White lists 10 verses in Romans that contain the expression “*God forbid*” Romans 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11. Although the expression occurs elsewhere in the AV1611, only these 10 have been used for the overall total.
4. The first figure at the bottom of the JB\* column is for the JB, the second for the DR, JR.

Table 5 contains the 37 passages from Table 4, based on 35 verses in total. Table 5 shows that the modern bibles are found to depart from the AV1611 in 136 of 148 readings or 92% on average. This level of departure from the AV1611 would be even higher were it not for the agreement of the JB, NWT with the AV1611, which *exceeds* that of the NIV, NASV. Table 5 shows that the NIV, NASV each departs respectively from the AV1611 in no fewer than *35 and 36 of the 37 passages listed*.

Table 5 shows further that the DR, JR agrees with the NIV, NASV, JB, NWT against the AV1611 in 10 of the 37 references and with the NIV, NASV, JB in 12 of the 37 references, or in 27% and 32% of the readings respectively. (The DR, JR has “*God forbid*” in all 10 of the references listed in Romans. It departs with the NASV, JB, NWT from the AV1611 in Amos 4:4, where the NIV follows the AV1611 and with the NIV, NASV, NWT from the AV1611 in Hebrews 9:7, where the JB follows the AV1611, making a total of 14 departures from the AV1611 in Table 5 or 38%.) This level of agreement is comparable with the results of Table 3 – see previous chapter – and *Tables A1-A4* for the DR, JR. See *Appendix*. The DR, JR (Challoner’s Revision, 1749-52) therefore signals further departures from the AV1611 by later post-1611 bibles. See below.

The DR, JR agrees with the AV1611 in Genesis 50:20, 1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Samuel 8:18, 1 Chronicles 5:26, Matthew 19:18, Mark 9:18, Luke 18:12, Acts 7:45, 19:2, 22:9b, Romans 13:9a, b, Hebrews 4:8 in addition to the 10 references in Romans for “*God forbid*,” i.e. in 23 of the 37 references, or 62%, a level of agreement comparable with that of Wycliffe and Tyndale/Coverdale. See Table 4.

But note again from Table 4 that as the English Reformation progressed, overall agreement of the pre-1611 bibles, i.e. Tyndale/Coverdale, Bishops’, Geneva, with the eventual AV1611 Text appreciably *increased*, with respect to these sample passages that James White lists as “*problems in the KJV*.”

However, Table 5, like Tables 3 and *Tables A1-A4*, shows clearly that the modern bibles have served only to increase the extent of *departure* from the AV1611 from that of the earliest ‘modern’ bible, the DR, JR, Challoner’s Revision, 1749-52.

Most significantly, Table 5 shows that the modern deviations from the AV1611 Text are *towards* Rome and Watchtower and indeed *beyond* Rome and Watchtower.

This chapter concludes with a summary of these findings, with two additional post-1611 bibles inserted for additional comparison; the RV and NKJV. See Table 6 and accompanying notes.

2012 Note: Tables 6, 9 include summary results for the NJB, New Jerusalem Bible, versus the AV1611. Little change is observed between the JB and the NJB except that the more modern NJB shows even more departures from the AV1611 than its predecessor.



**Table 6**  
**English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy – To and From the AV1611**

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Gen. 50:20												
1 Sa. 10:24												
2 Sa. 8:18												
1 Ki. 10:28												
1 Chr. 5:26								NJB				
Is. 65:11												
Am. 4:4												
Mat. 19:18												
Mat. 27:44												
Mark 6:20												
Mark 9:18												
Luke 18:12												
Acts 5:30												
Acts 7:45												
Acts 12:4												
Acts 19:2												
Acts 22:9a												f.n.
Acts 22:9b												
Ro. 3:4, 6												
Ro. 3:31												
Ro. 6:2, 15												
Ro. 7:7, 13												
Ro. 8:16												
Ro. 8:26												
Ro. 9:14												
Ro. 11:1												
Ro. 11:11												
Ro. 13:9a												
Ro. 13:9b												f.n.
1 Cor. 4:4												
Heb. 4:8												
Heb. 9:7												
Heb. 10:23												
James 3:2												
Departures	16	12	6	6	0	14	21	33/34	32	36	35	31/33
<b>% Depart.</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>89/92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>84/89</b>

**Notes:**

1. Table 6 lists 37 passages of scripture adapted from *The King James Only Controversy* by James White. The author designates these passages as “*problems in the KJV*” p 223ff.
2. Mr White insists that the modern versions, NIV, NASV, NKJV, largely correct these “*problems*” and that these 37 passages are therefore representative of modern ‘improvements’ over the AV1611 as a whole. (This author’s separate review of Mr White’s book has shown that they are not.)
3. These 37 passages have therefore been used as test passages for comparison with the AV1611 for both pre-1611 and post-1611 bibles, set against church history from Medieval to modern times.
4. Table 6 lists the results for comparison of these 37 passages with the AV1611 for 12 bibles in total. Individual readings have been omitted for brevity but may be checked using the sources listed below.
5. A clear cell in Table 6 denotes agreement between the specified bible and the AV1611 with respect to the sense of the reading, although the actual wording may differ between the two bibles.
6. A shaded cell in the table denotes departure of the specified bible from the AV1611. The shaded cell marked NJB refers to an NJB reading that departs from the AV1611. The shaded cells marked f.n. refer to NKJV readings that match the AV1611 in the NKJV text but follow the NIV in the footnotes.
7. 5 pre-1611 bibles have been used; WY, Wycliffe, TY/C, Tyndale/Coverdale in the Old Testament, BIS, Bishops’, GEN, Geneva. The texts of these bibles may be found here, [www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/). (Insert any search text and click on the verse displayed to show the NAVBAR. Use the NAVBAR to go to any bible chapter and uncheck *Include Resources* box for an uninterrupted text display.)
8. 8 post-1611 bibles have been used; DR, Douay-Rheims (Challoner’s Revision, 1749-1752), RV, Revised Version, JB/N, Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles respectively, also for the results cells, NWT, New World Translation, NASV, New American Standard Version, NIV, 1984 New International Version, NKJ, New King James Version. [www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/) has been used for the DR, RV, NIV\*, NASV, NKJV, [www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm](http://www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm) for the NWT, a printed edition for the JB, [www.catholic.org/bible/](http://www.catholic.org/bible/) for the NJB. \*Checked against 2011 readings via [biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/](http://biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/).
9. Table 6 shows that divergence of the pre-1611 bibles from the AV1611 Text for the 37 test passages decreases markedly as successive translations appear. The corresponding increasing convergence of the pre-1611 bibles with the AV1611 parallels the advance of the English Reformation from its inception in the 14<sup>th</sup> century to its maturity in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, followed by its crowning achievement early in the 17<sup>th</sup> century - the AV1611 Holy Bible.
10. Table 6 shows further that the post-1611 bibles not only diverge increasingly from the AV1611 Text, in agreement with Rome and Watchtower but the popular ‘fundamentalist’ translations, NIV, NASV, diverge from the AV1611 even beyond contemporary Papist and JW versions, changing well over 90% of the test passages. Even the supposedly ‘conservative’ NKJV follows this divergence, with well over 80% departures from the AV1611. The accelerating departure of the post-1611 bibles from the AV1611 corresponds to the deepening apostasy of the church in these last days. *All* modern bibles are germane to this apostasy.

## Chapter 10 – “Questions and Answers”

James White<sup>3 p 243ff</sup> purports in this chapter to “provide short, concise answers to some of the most common questions that arise when discussing the King James Only controversy.”

The first question that White raises is with respect to Psalm 12:6, 7 and whether or not “it is a promise that God will preserve His WORDS.”

White does his utmost to deny that Psalm 12:6, 7 is such a promise. His approach is to cast doubt on the plain statement of scripture, Genesis 3:1.

***“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever”*** Psalm 12:6, 7.

White insists that Psalm 12:6, 7 “[doesn’t] refer to the King James Version of the Bible [‘Bible’ still unspecified after 243 pages].” He insists further, his emphasis, that “no-where does this passage tell us **how** God will preserve His words...[either] by ensuring that no one can ever change the substance of those words, or...that there is one infallible version in one or more languages or translations.”

White seeks to muddy the issue further by means of his admission that he doesn’t really know what Psalm 12:6, 7 actually means. He alludes to the NIV reading, which agrees with the DR, JB, NWT – See **Appendix, Table A1**, and speculates, his emphasis, that, “it is quite possible that verse 7 does not refer back to “words of the Lord” in verse 6, but instead back to those in verse 5 of whom the Lord says, “I will set **him** in the safety for which he yearns” (NKJV).”

Note first that the NKJV – and NASV – reading for verse 5 is not that of the AV1611, which is a reference to the Antichrist<sup>192 57ff, 67-72</sup>.

***“I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him”*** Psalm 12:5b. See also Psalm 10, the subject of which, doctrinally, is the Antichrist.

Although it reads differently from the NASV, NKJV, the NIV likewise deletes the reference to the Antichrist, as follows “I will protect them from those that malign them.” Psalm 12:5 in the modern versions is yet more evidence for the modern translators covering up for the Devil.

White has to allude to the NIV in his full statement of Psalm 12:6, 7 because the NASV has a halfway reading in Psalm 12:7, by which it retains the first “**them**” but changes the second “**them**” to “**him**.” The Geneva Bible<sup>49</sup> does likewise in Psalm 12:7 and all the other pre-1611 bibles have readings similar to the NIV. The AV1611 therefore preserves both the Lord’s words and the true reading for Psalm 12:7.

It should be noted in passing that the NIV reading for Psalm 12:7 is incorrect. Note the underlined first person plural pronouns that the NIV has substituted for “**them**” in the AV1611.

***“O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever.”***

Dr Gipp<sup>59 p 53, 343</sup> points out that the underlying Hebrew words in Psalm 12:7 are third person plural and therefore are correctly translated as such in the AV1611. He states that no extant Hebrew manuscript has the first person plural terms in verse 7 and therefore the NIV reading is wrong. Yet, as Dr Gipp shows further, Dr Kenneth Barker, executive Director of the NIV Translation centre, whom White<sup>3 p 214-216, 245-6</sup> holds in high esteem, re-

fused point-blank to acknowledge this blatant error in his translation. (See comments below that show why the singular pronoun “*him*” in English could erroneously be introduced into Psalm 12:7 but even this error does not allow for a *first* person pronoun as in the NIV.)

White’s first objection to Psalm 12:7 as applying to the AV1611 ignores verse 6. See Dr Ruckman’s and Dr Vance’s remarks under *The Revision Conspiracy* about the 7-fold purification of the Lord’s words that took place on earth, i.e. “*in a furnace of earth*” with respect to 7 languages, Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin, Syrian, German, English and with respect to 7 English translations using all available sources, Tyndale’s, Coverdale’s, Matthew’s, Great, Bishops’, Geneva and finally the 1611 Authorized King James Bible. Note that Dr Vance’s analysis neatly disposes of White’s second objection to Psalm 12:6, 7 in the AV1611, which is both “*the substance of His words*” and “*one infallible translation*” consisting of “*those words*.”

Psalm 12:6, 7 must be seen in the light of church history and fulfilled prophecy with respect to the final refinement of the Lord’s pure, preserved words in the form of the AV1611, just as the familiar passages of Psalm 22 and Isaiah 53 must be seen as fulfilled prophecy with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ. White’s first and second objections to Psalm 12:6, 7 as applying the AV1611 are a trivialisation of scripture because they are the same as objecting to Psalm 22, Isaiah 53 or any other Messianic passage being applied to the Lord Jesus Christ simply because such passages don’t explicitly mention the name of Jesus Christ.

White could have resolved the apparently competing readings of “*them*” and “*him*” in Psalm 12:7 if he had been prepared to consult the marginal reading for this verse, since he believes so strongly<sup>3 p 77</sup> that “*the importance of marginal notes to the KJV Only controversy should not be overlooked*.” The marginal reading for Psalm 12:7 explains “*them*” as “*every one of them*.” It is easy to see, therefore, how many translators, even the faithful pre-1611 translators, could have misunderstood ‘the Hebrew’ to be a reference to the first “*him*” of verse 5 whereas the King’s men correctly understood the meaning to be a reference to all of the Lord’s words, i.e. “*them*.”

Drs Holland and Ruckman dispose of White’s third objection via the NIV reading for Psalm 12:7 as follows.

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 209</sup> writes, “*The Hebrew can be understood to refer to either “them” or “him” [see explanation immediately above for the use of the term “him” in verse 7]...Nevertheless, the first half of this passage is without question as to its meaning. The words of the Lord are pure, and the whole of Scripture testifies to this truth. It somewhat lacks consistency to think that God’s words would be pure in their inception and yet lost in their transmission. If the Almighty takes time to purify his words, it would seem he would take just as much care to preserve them. Otherwise, why purify them at all?*”

White does not address this searching question.

Dr Ruckman<sup>192 p 67-72, 193</sup> states, partly in reply to the denial of Psalm 12:6, 7 as a promise for the providential preservation of scripture on the part of White’s fellow traveller, Doug Kutilek, available as an online article, [www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek\\_why\\_psalms.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek_why_psalms.htm).

Emphases are Dr Ruckman’s.

“*All of the new versions (with one exception\*) have altered the word “them” in verse 7 to the word “us,” so the antecedent will not refer to the “words” of God. The word for “them” occurs twice in the verse. It appears as a suffix on the third word in all Hebrew*

*manuscripts. It is not “US” in one single Hebrew manuscript from ANY set of ANY manuscripts used for ANY edition of ANY Masoretic text.*

\*Actually two, as Dr Ruckman subsequently explains.

*“The word “us” has been inserted after the fourth word in every translation but the NKJV and the KJV, and the word “us” has been inserted again in every English translation after the third word...*

*“A literal translation would have said “Thou shalt keep THEM (“the words of the Lord”), O Lord; Thou wilt preserve IT [i.e. “every one of them”] from this generation forever.” The word “US” is not in any text. It is the result of a private interpretation of the passage that runs the “THEM” back to “the poor...the needy” of verse 5. What happened to those “words” that were “tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times”?...*

*“What is the point in “verbal plenary inspiration” if you are going to lose the words on purpose? Would God start something He couldn’t finish? What did Jesus Christ think He was doing by telling His disciples to keep His “words” (John 14:23), when the scriptures He, Himself, quoted were NOT the original autographs containing THOSE WORDS? Proverbs 22:17, 21, and Psalm 119:89, 140 are the Holy Spirit’s “mind” in these matters. “The words of the Lord” are pure, powerful, penetrating, preserved, personified (Christ) and permanent. The reference to the Hebrew singular [“it”]...is a warning that the WORDS will be preserved in THE WORD...*

*““Purified seven times”...The work was done on “earth” (not “For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven”) and when it was done it went out in seven instalments:*

- 1. The original Hebrew of ninety-nine percent of the Old Testament.*
- 2. The original Aramaic of one percent of the Old Testament.*
- 3. The original Greek of the New Testament...*
- 4. In the first and earliest translation: the Old Syriac.*
- 5. In the second oldest translation: the Old Latin.*
- 6. In the German Reformation for the continent of Europe (Martin Luther).*
- 7. For the ENTIRE WORLD from the seafaring nation of Great Britain: the AV of 1611.*

*“There is no antecedent for “this generation,” and that is why the scholars ran it back to the “poor” and “needy” BEFORE the matter of the “words of the Lord” showed up. If the text was left as it stood, within the context of where God put it, you would read that the GENERATION that saw the publication of the English Protestant Reformation Bible (AV 1611) would “keep God’s word” (see Rev. 3:8 for confirmation) and from that generation on the words would be available to anyone.*

*“We have them. Sorry if you don’t. That’s your problem. Our Book was translated into every major language in the world before Westcott and Hort restored the Jesuit text of Rome...*

*“The NASV translators are the only ones (this time) that translate the Hebrew literally in verse 7 (“them” and “him”), and they do this knowing that it is unintelligible after it is done unless they make the “him” refer to the WORDS. Since we already know how the NASV translators feel about the “words of God” and the “word of the Lord” (see their treatment of Prov. 13:13; 2 Tim. 1:13, 2:15; Luke 4:4; Prov. 8:8; and 2 Cor. 2:17) we*

don't have to think that they are referring to the **personality** of the scriptures. Paul does that (Gal. 3:8; Rom. 9:17; Heb. 4:12-13) but no modern translator does [i.e. the NASV remains "unintelligible" and the NIV, NKJV remain incorrect]...

"Now, for those tenderfeet (NIV, RSV, LXX, NRSV, Custer...Kutilek, et al.)...we have some good advice to offer. Read Treblinka, The Theory and Practise of Hell, Into that Darkness, Commandant of Auschwitz, Auschwitz on Trial, and Doctors of Death, David's "generation" ("**from this generation FOREVER**") were "kept" and preserved" about as well as the nine hundred people who followed Jim Jones. The "poor and needy" of Israel have been flayed alive, burned alive, shot and beaten to death for two thousand years **since** David's time. Not **one** of them could claim one promise of "preservation" or even help (or even a drink of water) from **ONE** verse in any Psalm in the Book, when he was delivered to Rudolph Hoess, Franz Stangl, Koch, Kramer, Himmler, Eichmann, Diels, and Pohl. Fourteen million more are getting ready to go through it **again** right now."

Dr Ruckman writes as follows, in part, in reply to Doug Kutilek, from whose article he quotes. Dr Ruckman's comments apply equally to White's evaluation of Psalm 12:6, 7.

"Here is the "pitch," the motive behind it being to get rid of the words of God in 1992.

"Verse 7 declares that God will keep them and preserve **THEM**. What is the antecedent of **THEM**? Based on English, there appears to be two possibilities. The first and nearest possible antecedent is the plural noun "words," repeated twice in verse 6. This appears to fit nicely [!!!]. Words is, furthermore, the nearest possible antecedent to **THEM**, which also seems to support this view."

"Yes it do, don't it? This view was "supported" by every edition of the King James Bible that came out for 380 years. No "us" or "him" occurs in any edition of a King James Bible...

"The other, more remote possible antecedents of the doubled them are poor and needy of verse 5...being collective nouns in English, they can take plural pronouns."

"This is an obvious attempt to get rid of the **WORDS** of God mentioned in the **immediate context** (vs. 7) and skip back to verse 5...on goes Doug..."

"The English, then, is somewhat ambiguous. The grammar of the English translation allows two possible antecedents for them."

"Not if you take the **obvious** one, no.

"It cannot be decided [note the dogmatism] on the basis of English grammar. We are not limited to the English translation but have access to the Hebrew original (!)"

"THE HEBREW ORIGINAL?" Did he mean the original Hebrew "text"? No. Did he mean even "THE Hebrew text?" No. What he meant was: "We have access to non-original Hebrew copies of Hebrew manuscripts, written in non-original Hebrew."

"By the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive [Ephesians 4:14]." This is the character...who said if you said the "**them**" of verse 7 referred to the pure words of God in verse 6, you were deceitful and dishonest (see under Section I). Some folks have their nerve, don't they? Old "Dugout Doug" hasn't got a straight bone in his body..."

"In the Hebrew of Psalm 12, the pronouns translated them in verse 7 are both masculine - the first them being plural in number, the second being singular (him, literally),

*particularizing every individual in the group....” Then in true Alexandrian fashion Doug says “with slightly different vowel points in Hebrew, the second pronoun [he forgot to tell you it was a SUFFIX added to a Hebrew verb; Doug never has been very good at Hebrew] could be understood as the first person plural common, viz., us. So, the antecedent noun can be expected to be masculine in gender and plural in number.””*

Where does Kutilek get the authority to create “slightly different vowel points in Hebrew”? Is he able to re-write the Hebrew text? Dr Ruckman’s comments continue.

*“Ready for the kill? You have been set up. All Doug has to prove is that the GENDER of the suffix “them” in verse 7 cannot refer to the “WORDS” of verse 6; because the genders don’t match. “WORDS” is a feminine word: “him” (“it,” “us,” or “them”) in verse 7 (depending on choice, preference, and opinion) is masculine.”*

Kutilek’s argument from gender is as follows, from his online article.

*“The word rendered words twice in verse 6 is a feminine plural noun in both cases; the words poor and needy in verse 5 are both masculine and plural in Hebrew. While the English translation is ambiguous and allows two different antecedents, the Hebrew is clear and plain - the antecedent of them is the poor and needy ones of verse 5, not the words of verse 6. Gender agreement of pronoun and antecedent demonstrates this.”*

Dr Ruckman’s comments continue, with an additional citation from Kutilek.

*““As with shamar [i.e. “keep”], when God is the subject of the verb, the doer of the action of the verb, the object kept or preserved is always **people**,” i.e., that is, every other place EXCEPT in Psalm 12. Doug now abandons the Psalm and tries his hand at interpreting scripture with scripture. He lists “shamar” as used in twenty-six other verses. In the twenty-six references Doug listed, there was not one reference in the twenty-six connected with “**the words of the Lord are pure words.**” This time, in order to get truth on the context from a more remote context, Doug picked all the passages (Ps. 16:1; 17:8; 25:20; 86:2; 116:6; 121:3, 7, 8; 146:9, etc.) that had nothing to do with the “WORD” of God or the “WORDS” of God...There wasn’t one mention of God’s “WORDS” in any of Doug’s twenty-six “cross references”...*

*“The “**poor and needy**” were not in verse 6. “**The words of the Lord**” were in verse 6.*

*“Nonetheless! “To find a promise in verse 7 of the promise of God’s written word [note, he used the collective singular for “words”] is to introduce a subject totally foreign to the context.”*

*“And there it is like a dead shrimp.*

*“God had just introduced a subject “totally foreign to the context.” He had just said “**The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.**” This was the “foreign” context in which verse 7 appeared. Having lost the first antecedent, on goes this blind guide of the blind trying to find an antecedent for “**this generation.**”*

*“Surprise! Boo! No antecedent.*

*“The “oppressor” in verse 5 was singular (“him”). (Which, by the way, is a reference, **doctrinally**, to someone that neither Doug, nor any man he quoted, knew anything about. The doctrinal reference to “him” in verse 5 is to the Antichrist, as in verse 3). But Doug couldn’t get HIM to be “collective” enough to refer to a whole generation...none of them can explain how God promised to preserve “**the poor and needy**” from “**this generation,**” so do you know what they finally did? Can’t you guess? They dug ’em up a “Tar-*

*gum” and gave it out as “you will preserve them from this EVIL generation forever.” The word “EVIL” is not found in the “Hebrew original” (to cite Doug), nor is it in “THE Hebrew text,” nor is it in the “Original text,” nor does it appear in any copy of ANY Hebrew text. It was added to force you to get rid of the preservation of God’s WORDS.”*

Like White, Kutilek uses several ‘authorities’ to deny Psalm 12:6, 7 as a promise for the providential preservation of scripture, all of them either obscure, like the LXX, the Targum and Jerome’s Vulgate, or like the Geneva Bible – see reading above – superseded by the AV1611.

Kutilek evades the absence of a suitable antecedent for **“this generation”** as follows, from his online article. His comments are mere speculation.

*“Had verse 7 referred to God’s preserving His Word from corrupting influences and evil men, we should have expected the preceding verses of the psalm to speak of the attack of men upon the Scriptures - a Jehoiakim with a penknife or the like - but such is obviously not the case. It is persecuted men, not written words, that occupy the psalmist’s attention and thought. To employ verse 7 as a proof text for any doctrine of Scripture preservation does extreme violence to a context which is unmistakably clear.”*

It was *“unmistakably clear”* before being subjected to *“extreme violence”* by Kutilek. His reference to the Targum, from his online article, is as follows.

*“The Targum to Psalms, the interpretive Jewish translation of the Hebrew into Aramaic which dates from the early Christian centuries, reads, “you, O Lord, will keep the righteous ones, you will protect them from this evil generation forever.” The antecedent of “them” is spelled out plainly.”*

This is what White<sup>3 p 121</sup> describes as *“fine ongoing work”* on the part of Kutilek and others, the work of adding to the scriptures, as necessary, in order to overthrow the scriptures, just as Rome and Watchtower do. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Doug never found the antecedent for **“this generation”**...[But] did he really believe that GENDERS had to match?...after basing his main argument on gender (he never did tell you what it meant to be preserved from any generation **“forever”**!), did you really think that Doug was serious when he started that stuff about the **“words”** being feminine and the **“them”** in verse 7 being masculine?...You would think so, wouldn’t you?*

*““Based on clear evidence from grammar and context and confirmed by the best Bible expositors, it can only be concluded that Psalm 12:6, 7 has nothing at all to do with the preservation of God’s Word. It says nothing for or against it. It does not speak to the issue at all. It is, therefore, wholly irrelevant to the discussion and must not be appealed to as a proof text regarding Bible preservation. We can understand how some through ignorance have misapplied this text, but with the above evidence in hand, to continue to apply these verses to any doctrine of Bible preservation is to handle the Word of God deceitfully and dishonestly, something unworthy of any child of God. Let the Scriptures speak, and let us follow them wherever they lead us.”*

#### **“THE BIBLICAL EVIDENCE AND BIBLICAL FACTS**

*“1. Kutilek couldn’t explain in 1,000 years the mess he made of the text when he got through with it. For being unable to locate **“this generation”** you would have to believe that **“the poor and needy”** would only be preserved from David’s generation onward. Psalm 12 is a Psalm of David.*



“Why would God suddenly give a promise about taking care of poor and needy Jewish saints (not just “saints,” as Doug has misled you, so you would believe it was for New Testament saints in the church)? Were **“the poor and needy”** Jewish saints preserved in 70 AD? How about 1939 AD? Would you like to try 1941-1945? Did you know of 6,000,000 Jews slaughtered in Poland, Austria, Germany, France, and Bulgaria more than ninety percent of them were lower middle-class Jews and of these more than twenty-five percent were on a poverty level? And he didn’t say “saints.” He said **“the poor and the needy.”** You are to **presume** they were saints. Doug...failed to notice the use of the expression in Job, Psalms, James, and Luke 16 [i.e. **“beggar”** verse 20]. It is at a time when all the poor and needy are “good folks” and all of the rich are “the bad guys” [i.e. the Tribulation]...

“2. If old “Dugout Doug” really believed genders were so decisive, why didn’t he drop Nestle’s Greek text fifty years ago, along with the ASV, NASV, NIV? Doug swore...that 1 John 5:7, 8 should read as it does in the Vatican manuscripts, and as it stands in the RV, RSV, NRSV, ASV, NASV, NIV, and NEB. Doug Kutilek accepts words that do NOT match any gender in the antecedent: not even if three words are in the antecedent. In 1 John 5:7, 8, the wording at the end of the verse says και οι τρεις εις το εν εισιν. Do you know what **“THESE THREE”** (masculine plural) refers to in Kutilek’s “Greek original”?...its antecedent is **THREE NEUTER SINGULARS** (το πνευμα και το υδωρ και το αιμα).

“In Job 31:11, the **“this”** (**“FOR THIS IS...”**) is a reference to Job being enticed by a woman (feminine), and others bowing down on his wife (feminine). These two feminine singulars make up the subject (of **“FOR THIS...”**) into a **feminine plural**. But **“FOR THIS”** is not a feminine plural: it is a **masculine singular**. Kutilek...thought that a masculine could not have a feminine antecedent (**“WORDS”** in verse 6). **“Words”** is a **feminine plural**.

“Such are the ways of these hypocritical liars who talk about “based on the clear evidence from GRAMMAR...etc.” ...trying to get you to abandon belief in the preservation of God’s WORDS on the grounds of grammatical rules which [Kutilek] hasn’t checked, doesn’t believe in, and doesn’t follow! You talk about “nerve.” The Lord Jesus Christ is called **“IT”** (neuter) in Genesis 3, a **“THING”** (neuter) in Luke 1:35, and these apostate Alexandrians never opened their mouths, but...when a verse shows up that deals with the authority of God’s written WORDS, boy do they ever get [grammatical].

“**“Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written”** Mark 7:6a...

“3. Does anyone who constantly reads that Book think that God cannot CHANGE the main subject in ONE verse without a warning at all, and go completely into a different subject? Look at the “context” of Psalm 89:38 and compare verses 34, 35, 36, 37, with it. How is that for “context”? Look at Isaiah 9:1-2, where He altered the context by an interval of 2,000 years by omitting nineteen words OUT of the context. The first nineteen words in Isaiah 9:1 were NOT fulfilled in Matthew 4:14-16. Furthermore, another eight words in the middle of the verse were omitted.

“Now imagine knowing this...and then along comes some incredible pipsqueak and says that a collective **“THEM”** in verse 7 of Psalm 12 could not be the **“THEM”** in verse 6 because you have to keep both “thems” in the context of verse 5!...

“A. He had to add a word to the “Hebrew original” to make sense.

“B. He had to feign genuine concern for grammatical genders, which he ignores.

“C. He forgot that the WORD of God in the Old Testament could also have been **“THE WORD”** of John 1:1, in which case, it would be MASCULINE.

“D. He had to ignore the immediate context of the passage.

“E. He had to list cross references that were not related to the passage.

“F. He had to profess to believe that he had “scriptures” that spoke to him (scriptures that would lead “US”) when [he] had stated two dozen times publicly that “scriptures” don’t exist anywhere, because **“all scripture is given by inspiration of God,”** and Doug has never seen nor read “scripture” inspired in that fashion.”

Doug Kutilek’s own website confirms Dr Ruckman’s statement above, this author’s underlining:

*“This website is dedicated to the defense of the Bible as originally written, against the flood of falsehood propagated by King James Onlyism.”*

As Will Kinney rightly observes, see **Chapter 4**, “Do you see where Mr. Kutilek is coming from? He is his own Final Authority [like James White]. He has no inerrant, complete, inspired Bible to give you or recommend. He is like those of old of whom God says in the last verse of the book of Judges: “In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” Judges 21:25.”

Kutilek, like White, has no ‘bible.’

White’s second question is about copyright, which modern bibles have but the AV1611 does not. White denies that the absence of modern copyright<sup>8 p 29</sup> is either proof that the AV1611 is “God’s Word” or that it is “the best.”

White insists that “*The KJV carries what is called the Cum Privilegio. Technically the KJV belongs to the English crown, which authorized and paid for its translation nearly four hundred years ago...the KJV was first printed by the royal printer, [and] for a hundred years no one else could print it. Does this not sound pretty much like a modern copyright? It would seem so. So again we find the KJV Only argument to be inconsistent, involving a double standard.*”

Yet again, it is James White who is ‘inconsistent,’ with ‘a double standard.’ His own book, on the page following the inside title page, repeatedly states “*used by permission*” with respect to the publishers of the modern versions from which White quotes, NIV, NASV, NKJV. However, the only statement that refers to the AV1611 on this page is “*Scripture quotations identified KJV are from the King James Version of the Bible.*”

The above statement does “*not sound pretty much like a modern copyright.*”

The TBS<sup>194</sup> explains that, “*The printing of the Bible in Great Britain has been subject to a number of restrictions. The “privilegio” of undertaking this important work has been granted to very few, and generally speaking the restrictions have resulted in a higher degree of accuracy and uniformity without limiting the number of copies circulated.*”

The TBS article gives an overview of the struggle between the Robert Barker, the King’s Printer and Cambridge University for the privilege of printing the AV1611, originally the sole province of the King’s Printer and indicates that the issue was resolved by the year 1663. “*The right to print [the Bible and Prayer Book] was then [by Royal prerogative] vested in the King’s Printer and the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge.*”

So White is wrong in his assertion that no one other than the royal printer could print the AV1611 “*for a hundred years.*”

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 92-3</sup> has these informative comments on *Cum Privilegio*, also found on his site<sup>55</sup>.

*“Another common myth concerning the KJV is that it was under the sole printing authority of the crown. There were no copyrights in those days, but some have suggested that the KJV was the Cum Privilegio (i.e. with privilege) of King James and the English crown, and that only the royal printer could publish the KJV. In addressing the KJV Only advocates, James White states, “But we should point out that the KJV carries what is called the Cum Privilegio. Technically the KJV belongs to the English crown,...the KJV was first printed by the royal printer, and that for a hundred years no one else could print it. Does this not sound pretty much like a modern copyright? It would seem so. So again we find the KJV Only argument to be inconsistent, involving a double standard.” (White, p. 244).*

*“This statement is totally in error. The Royal Printer was Robert Barker. However, we find that the KJV was printed both in England and outside the country by others, not counting Barker. Consider the following statements:*

*““In the year 1642, a folio edition of King James’s Version was printed at Amsterdam by “Joost Broersz, dwelling in the Pijlsteegh, in the Druckerije.”...The notes of the King James’s Bible are omitted, and the arguments and annotations of the “Breeches” Bible [Geneva Bible, Genesis 3:7, with “breeches” versus “aprons” AV1611] are inserted in their place.” (John R. Dore, *Old Bibles: An Account of the Early Versions of the English Bible*, p. 345)*

*“In fact, Bibles with the KJV text but with Geneva notes were printed in Holland in 1642, 1672, 1683, 1708, 1715 and in England in 1649. (Jack Lewis, *The English Bible: From KJV to NIV*, p. 29).*

*“A small octavo Testament was issued at Edinburgh, by the Heirs of Hart, in 1628 (the Anfro Hart whose “Breeches” Bible were so highly esteemed). This is the first Testament printed in Scotland of King James’s Version. (Dore, pp. 338- 339).*

*““Although the Universities always claimed the right to print the Bible, Cambridge had not exercised that right since the year 1589; but in 1628 a duodecimo Testament was published at Cambridge, by the printers to the University, and the following year Thomas and John Buck issued the first Cambridge Bible.” (Dore, p. 339).*

*““The University of Oxford did not begin to print Bibles until the year 1675, when the first was issued in quarto size; the spelling was revised by Dr. John Fell, Dean of Oxford.” (Dore, p. 346).*

*““In England, the printing of the Authorized or King James Version of the Bible (KJV) and the Book of Common Prayer (BCP) of 1662 is the monopoly of the Royal Printer, by virtue of a patent first granted to Christopher Barker in 1577. Only the University Presses of Cambridge and Oxford are permitted by royal charter to override this monopoly; one other publisher, originally Scottish, is an accepted interloper.” (M. H. Black, *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, 1993, p. 617).*

*““By its royal charter of 1534, the University of Cambridge had acquired the perpetual right to appoint three printers, who could print “all manner of books.” The right preexisted Barker’s patent, and was taken to cover Bibles, so Cambridge printed a Geneva Bible in 1591 and its first KJV in 1629. Oxford acquired a similar charter in 1636, and in the 1670s printed Bibles.” (Black, p.618).*

*“Once again, the evidence shows that the attacks against the KJV are unwarranted.”*

White's next question concerns Westcott and Hort, where he aims to exonerate them from the charges of being "occultists" and "closet Roman Catholics."

White's only point of substance is with respect to the particular question, "Were they occultists?" White states, his emphasis, "The "Ghostlie Guild"...club was formed to *investigate* strange occurrences, not engage in devilish activity."

Westcott and Hort therefore violated an Old Testament principle that holds true in the New.

***"Take heed to thyself that thou be not snared by following them, after that they be destroyed from before thee; and that thou enquire not after their gods, saying, How did these nations serve their gods? even so will I do likewise"*** Deuteronomy 12:30.

Deuteronomy 12:30 shows how investigation *leads* to engagement. Note also Numbers 25, where "Israel joined himself to Baal-peor" verse 3.

***"For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope"*** Romans 15:4.

***"Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come"*** 1 Corinthians 10:11.

In answer to White's attempted exoneration of Westcott and Hort, see **Chapter 4** for extensive documentation of their heresies, especially by Donald Waite<sup>92</sup> and note again Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>14 p 397ff, 515ff</sup> detailed study of their occultism and heathen philosophy. Dr Gipp<sup>59 Chapter 8</sup> has also written in detail on Westcott and Hort's heretical beliefs and David Daniels<sup>195 p 118ff, Appendix B</sup> has produced a most readable summary of Westcott and Hort's infidelity to the scriptures.

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>7 Part 4</sup> disclosures about Westcott's occultism, including those from his son, Arthur Westcott, who stated that his father "had faith in Spiritualism." Dr Mrs Riplinger counters White's notion that "The "Ghostlie Guild"...club was formed to *investigate* strange occurrences" as follows, her emphases.

*"[Westcott] speaks, as late as 1880 (age 55), about "fellowship with the spiritual world" and "the dominion which the dead have over us" (New Age Versions, p. 439).*

*"White needs practice parsing English sentences; Westcott's son said he had "faith" "in Spiritualism." White takes the very sentence wherein Westcott's son said his father B. F. had "faith" in "Spiritualism," and responds, "It's hard to understand how someone can take this and say that Arthur Westcott called his father a 'spiritualist.'" Webster defines 'spiritualism' as "the practices of spiritualists;" and "the belief that departed spirits hold intercourse with mortals by means of physical phenomena, as by rapping, or during abnormal mental states, as in trances, commonly manifested through a medium." Webster defines necromancy as, "communication with the spirits of the dead" [i.e. according to Webster, if not White, Westcott was a spiritualist].*

*"The pretense that Westcott and Hort's Ghostly Guild was 'scientific' rather than 'spiritualistic' is dissolved by the **many** references cited in the book [New Age Versions]. If it was scientific, it would not have aroused the "derision and even some alarm" by Cambridge colleagues who were "appalled" and referred to it as "mediaeval darkness." The Encyclopedia of Occultism and Parapsychology lists the Ghost Club as one in which "members related personal experiences concerning ghosts.""*

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger is responding to an earlier publication by White, who was aware<sup>3 p 123</sup> of Dr Mrs Riplinger's response, published as *The King James Version Ditches*

*Blind Guides*, when he wrote *The King James Only Controversy*. Her substantial disclosures about Westcott and Hort's occultism clearly forced White to redraft his own comments on this subject.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>96 p 94</sup> states further about Westcott and Hort's occultism in the 2007 edition of her book *Which Bible Is God's Word?* "*B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort...were actually the fathers of the New Age channelling movement; their Ghostly Guild evolved into the infamous Society for Psychical Research*" i.e. "**giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils**" 1 Timothy 4:1b.

See also Dr Grady's<sup>98 p 218</sup> reference to Westcott and Hort's occultism, in which he quotes Westcott as asserting that "*There are many others who believe it possible that the beings of the unseen world may manifest themselves to us in extraordinary ways*" and urging that such "*cases of supposed "supernatural" agency to be thoroughly sifted.*" Dr Grady notes, his emphasis, that Westcott's own son described his father's practices as "**spiritualism.**"

In addition to their occult leanings, this author's earlier work<sup>8 p 40-43, 283-6</sup> has summarised the antagonism of Westcott and Hort to the scriptures, encapsulated in Hort's description of the Textus Receptus underlying the AV1611 as "*villainous.*" It is the enmity of these two academics to the scriptures that is of central importance to the question that White poses but he effectively evades all discussion of this particular issue.

White's next question is about the presence of sodomites or sex perverts on the NIV translation committee. White denies their presence and cites Dr Kenneth Barker, Executive Director of the NIV Translation Center, as stating that "*These charges have no basis in fact...those who make such false charges could legitimately be sued for libel, slander, and defamation of character.*"

Dr Barker appears to have made this statement 14 years ago, in 1994. See below. No lawsuits appear to have taken place in that time. Dr Barker then asserts that, "*in the earliest stages of translation work on the NIV (in the late 1960s and early 1970s), Virginia Mollenkott was consulted briefly and only in a minor way on matters of English style...If we had known in the sixties what became public knowledge only years, later, we would not have consulted her at all. But it must be stressed that she did not influence the NIV translators and editors in any of their final decisions.*"

Virginia Mollenkott was a practising sex pervert at the time of her work<sup>8 p 314</sup> with Dr Barker and the NIV translation committee. Both White and Barker are lying, as Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>7 Part 7, 96 p 67-8, 43-4 2007 Edition</sup> makes plain. Her comments from *Blind Guides* are as follows, her emphases. Note that her disclosures again forced White to alter his comments in his later publication, because he makes no mention of Virginia Mollenkott's supposed five months' work on the NIV in *The King James Only Controversy*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows beyond any reasonable doubt that Virginia Mollenkott was not "*consulted briefly and only in a minor way.*"

"White is not alone in his ever evolving and **changing** 'story'. He states that Virginia Mollenkott worked on the NIV for "**five months.**" The NIV Translation Center seems to have been telling **callers** this over the phone, but when **written** confirmation is requested, that time period is denied. Kenneth Barker wrote in a letter (dated July 21, 1994), "*I do not know who at IBS [International Bible Society] told you that Mollenkott's involvement as a literary consultant was **five months** but, whoever it was, **he or she was mistaken.**" He states that she was involved "*in the **earliest** stages of the translation work (in the late sixties and early seventies...)" [The NIV began in 1966 and the N.T. was published in**

1973.] In case the reader has the NIV Translation Center's response, "The NIV and Homosexual and Lesbian Practice," you will note that the 'story' has **changed**. In that article it said, "**earliest** stages of the translation work on the NIV (in the late 1960's)." A letter from Virginia Mollenkott herself states, "I worked as NIV stylistic consultant for several **years**. To my knowledge throughout the **final** years of the work when initial translations were being polished." (June 12, 1994) [emphasis mine].

"When presented with the NIV Translation Center's **version** she writes, "If you want to do me a favor, you could set the record straight with IBS in Colorado Springs. But perhaps they would rather not be disturbed by the facts?!" (June 20, 1994). Was it months or years? Seems White and the NIV Translation Center, "would rather not be disturbed by the facts"! White's notion that, "When she took stands contrary to Biblical standards, she was removed from the project" is denied by Mollenkott, who states in a letter (Jan. 20, 1995),

"You are right that Barker is playing little word games. It would be a different story if Edwin Palmer were still alive: he knew me, had heard me speak, and sent me sheaf after sheaf of translations to review over a period of **three** or more **years** including several gift editions for the committee members when the work was first completed."

Christian bookseller in Bicester, Oxfordshire, England, Michael Penfold<sup>196</sup> has provided more detailed information on Virginia Mollenkott's long-term involvement with the NIV. He quotes White's<sup>3 p 245-6</sup> denial of sex perverts working on the NIV. inserts Dr Barker's statement to which White alludes and reproduces a letter to himself from Ms Mollenkott, dated December 18<sup>th</sup> 1996. She states in this letter that although none of the NIV translating committee, including Dr Edwin Palmer, executive secretary of the committee, knew that she was a sex pervert (lesbian), she worked extensively on the NIV from start to finish and she castigates Dr Barker for lying about her contribution to the project.

Mr Penfold reveals further that Ms Mollenkott wasn't the only sex pervert associated with the NIV. The late Dr Marten Woudstra was the chairman of the NIV's Old Testament Translation Committee and well known to his colleagues as a practising sodomite. As Penfold points out, Woudstra's involvement with the NIV was clearly more serious than Mollenkott's. Woudstra's influence on the NIV Old Testament removed the word "**sodomite(s)**" from all 5 occurrences in the Old Testament; Deuteronomy 23:17, 1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:46, 2 Kings 23:7 and replaced it with the unrealistically narrow term "**male shrine prostitutes**." Explicit warnings against this abomination have thus been eliminated from the NIV. (The NASV substitutes "**male cult prostitutes**" for "**sodomites**" in all 5 verses apart from 1 Kings 22:46 and the NKJV has "**perverted persons**" in the verses from 1 and 2 Kings and "**perverted one**" in Deuteronomy 23:17. Both these versions have therefore also clearly been influenced by attitudes similar to Woudstra's amongst their respective translating committees. Note also that the NIV, NASV and NKJV eliminate the association between child molesters and sodomites that the AV1611 reveals in Genesis 18:20, with respect to "**the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah**" and Genesis 19:4, "**the men of the city, even the men of Sodom, compassed the house round, both old and young, all the people from every quarter.**" The NIV, NKJV have "**the outcry against Sodom and Gomorrah**" in Genesis 18:12 but Genesis 18, 19 describe no such "**outcry**." The cry was coming from abused children in "**the cities of the plain**" that God overthrew Genesis 19:29, "**Sodom, and Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim**" Deuteronomy 29:23. The NASV has a halfway reading in Genesis 18:12, "**the outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah**" which suggests that these cities contained some decent citizens "**that sigh**

*and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof*" Ezekiel 9:4 but there were none, as Genesis 19:4 reveals.)

In sum, 'the dead hand of Woudstra' is evident throughout the modern version Old Testaments, where the abomination of sodomy arises.

David Cloud<sup>197</sup> has also published the facts about Mollenkott's and Woudstra's influence on the NIV, which apparently has also not yet resulted in any lawsuits, even though this material, like Penfold's, has been in the public domain for 7-10 years.

White further attempts to justify Dr Barker's falsehood by implying that "*King James himself was a homosexual.*" This is one of the many denigratory comments against James 1<sup>st</sup> that prominent historians of the Stuart period, such as Lady Antonia Fraser, have shown to be a lie<sup>8 p 272</sup>. See remarks in **Chapter 5**, with reference to the exhaustive, 390-page work by Stephen A. Coston Sr., entitled *King James... Unjustly Accused?*.

White's next question concerns Dr Ruckman's language. White denies that Dr Ruckman's approach can be excused on the grounds that "*the prophets of old spoke in strong terms, as did the Lord and the apostles.*"

White insists that Dr Ruckman "*is not the Lord, nor an apostle, nor a prophet*" and therefore Dr Ruckman's language amounts to "*mean-spiritedness*" because "*A true Christian scholar is a lover of truth*" and "*Blustery words and insulting invective are for those who have little substance to back up their position.*"

White has failed to identify "*truth*" unequivocally throughout his book. The nearest he approaches to "*truth*" is by means<sup>3 p 7</sup> of "*multiple translations of the Bible [unspecified]*" none of which, according to White, are the pure word of God between two covers. Moreover, although he<sup>3 p 182-3, 190-1</sup> pounces (in the only such instance he can find in Dr Ruckman's prolific writings) on Dr Ruckman's comments about James 5:16 that do need some qualification<sup>8 p 87</sup>, White has failed to refute with "*substance*" any of Dr Ruckman's statements about the AV1611 versus the modern versions as discussed at length in **Chapter 5**.

But White alludes to 2 Timothy 2:24-26 in an effort to show "*how we are to respond to those who contradict us.*"

***"And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will."***

White forgot Paul's exhortations to ordinary believers, who by definition are neither apostles nor "*prophets of old.*"

***"And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them"*** Ephesians 5:11. Such "*works of darkness*" include bible 'correction' and the 'correctors' should be rebuked along with their work. See *New Age Versions*.

***"Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear"*** 1 Timothy 5:20.

***"Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith"*** Titus 1:13b.

It may be argued that the second and third exhortations above have specific application to pastoral responsibilities but they are applicable to the present day believers, nevertheless, who are clearly not apostles or Old Testament prophets.

Dr Ruckman<sup>171 p x, xi</sup> has an interesting comment on his language for answering bible critics like James White as follows.

*“Herbert Evans has carried on a battle for the truth for years, in a cool, quiet, objective fashion, exactly as Pickering, [Wilkinson], and Philpot have done. Did the Alexandrian Cult accept their presentation? Of course not. They had no intention of listening to the truth to start with.”*

James White<sup>3 p 91-5</sup> certainly has no time for the courteous approach of a biblical scholar like Dr Edward F. Hills. Although acknowledging that Dr Hills did not “engage in...insulting rhetoric,” White nevertheless contemptuously lumps Dr Hills in with “*The King James Only Camp*” and accuses him of “being presumptuous with God’s truth [undefined]” because Dr Hills dared to “offer absolute certainty...at a cost: individual responsibility [to whom or what unidentified, see remarks in **Chapter 5**].”

Dr Ruckman then explains his own ‘approach’ to bible critics and concludes as follows.

*“In view of the fact that no amount of evidence will be accepted no matter HOW it is given, or WHO gives it, we do the only proper thing we can: we bomb their munitions dump. We publish for the believer the stock pile of ammunition used in Christian schools to talk the believer out of his faith in the Holy Bible, and then we obliterate this stock pile with an H-bomb made in 1611. It says **“LET GOD BR TRUE, AND EVERY MAN A LIAR”** (Rom. 3:4).”*

And Dr Ruckman<sup>16 p 234-6</sup> has this excellent response to James White’s misuse of 2 Timothy 2:24-26, his emphases.

*“Paul is talking about personal dealings with individuals on a personal basis. Note that all modern apostate Charismatics, apostate Catholics, and apostate Fundamentalists, **in line with the News Media**, assume that this means that the preacher is NEVER (no never!) to raise his voice at anyone, is never to bawl anyone out, is never to rebuke sharply, and is never to engage in “name calling”...*

*“What these modern, apostate, Fundamentalists have done is, they have talked themselves into believing they are “GODLY” on the grounds of two false presumptions:*

- 1. They have learned to talk and write piously so that no one can detect their fear, misery, frustration, and rebellion against the Holy Bible.*
- 2. They have altered the Bible in every place where it exposed this fear, misery, frustration, or rebellion.*

*“They, then, have used texts like 2 Timothy 2:24; 1 Corinthians 13; and Philippians 2:3 to justify **THEIR HYPOCRISY**. This makes them the sworn enemies of any preacher or teacher in their generation...who TALKS, OR WRITES, OR PREACHES **PLAINLY**. The proof can be produced in a court of law, for every one of these men has recommended a translation that alters Romans 1:18; Romans 1:25; Acts 1:3; 2 Timothy 2:15; 1 Timothy 6:5; 1 Timothy 6:10; 1 Timothy 6:20; Genesis 1:28; Revelation 11:15; Revelation 22:14; Ephesians 1:6; and Luke 2:33...”*

White seeks to alter 6 of these 12 verses, Luke 2:33, Romans 1:18, 25, 1 Timothy 6:5, 10, 2 Timothy 2:15. See **Chapters 5, 6, 9, Appendix, Table A1**. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Paul is giving ministerial instructions to a minister who is going to be doing **personal work** and **personal counselling** in a certain locality. His instructions have nothing to do with **public exposure of sin** (which must take place), **public preaching** of unsavoury truths (which must be done), **public writing** of apologetics and polemics against enemies*



of the truth (which would be necessary at times), or the pointing out by NAME (see 2 Tim. 4:14; 1 Tim. 5:20; 2 Tim. 2:17; and 3 John 9: etc.) of dangerous, professing Christians who will sidetrack new converts.

“He is talking about **personal deportment** when dealing privately with individuals.

“Modern “Christians” simply bundle ALL of these operations under 2 Timothy 2:24 and then condemn anyone who doesn’t agree with this God-dishonouring, disgraceful private interpretation. We get letters from this crew by the carload every month. Since 1945 they have multiplied like rabbits.”

James White’s attitude to Dr Mrs Riplinger and her research - see **Chapter 5** - bear out Dr Ruckman’s comments. The graciousness of Sister Riplinger’s speech is unsurpassed but White is as contemptuous of her as he is of Dr Ruckman.

White’s next question concerns God’s blessing of the AV1611 “*more than any other English translation.*”

White tries to deny God’s particular blessing of the AV1611. In doing so, he almost inadvertently evades his own question, which refers specifically to *English* translations – see above. He claims, his emphasis, that “*God blessed the Septuagint...And [Jerome’s] Vulgate. And translations in dozens of different languages as well. God has blessed the NASB, and the NIV and many others...Limiting God’s blessing to a particular translation of the Bible [still unspecified] is historically untenable and spiritually dangerous.*”

God’s ‘blessing’ of the NIV, NASV relative to God’s actual blessing of the AV1611 will be considered below but earlier in his book, White<sup>3 p 113</sup> criticises Dr Ruckman’s scathing (and correct) denunciation of the NKJV by posing the following question to which White effectively answers ‘no.’

“Does Dr Ruckman provide solid, meaningful arguments to back up such strong language?”

The question may be paraphrased as follows.

‘Does James White provide solid, meaningful arguments to back up such sweeping assertions about God’s supposed blessing of modern *English* versions?’

By inspection of White’s book, the simple, and correct, answer is, ‘no.’ Again, White is being ‘inconsistent’ and using a ‘double standard.’

White deviated from his original question by unnecessary reference to foreign language bibles, many of which derive from the AV1611 anyway, up to 800 by the year 1900<sup>198 p 390-1</sup>. See also the Trinitarian Bible Society site, [www.tbs-sales.org/](http://www.tbs-sales.org/) for a list of the many AV1611-based bibles in other languages that the society distributes worldwide.

The following comments will be limited to consideration of the fruits of *English* bibles, therefore, in keeping with White’s original question and because more than sufficient evidence exists to show what is ‘historically tenable and spiritually safe’ with respect to selection of the bibles that God has blessed in English and those which He has not, *in English*.

For God’s ‘blessing’ on the NIV, NASV, NKJV, note again Dr Gipp’s<sup>31 p 113</sup> remarks. See **Revision’s Romanizing Aftermath**.

“Today’s modern translations haven’t been able to spark a revival in a Christian school, let alone be expected to close a bar. In fact, since the arrival of our modern English translations, beginning with the ASV of 1901, America has seen:

1. *God and prayer kicked out of our public school.*
2. *Abortion on demand legalised.*
3. *Homosexuality accepted nationally as an “alternate life style”.*
4. *In home pornography via TV and VCR.*
5. *Child kidnapping and pornography running rampant.*
6. *Dope has become an epidemic.*
7. *Satanism is on the rise.*

*“If this is considered a “revival” then let’s turn back to the King James to STOP it.”*

The late Dr David Otis Fuller was a tremendous encouragement with respect to the final authority of the King James Bible and before he went to be with the Lord on February 21<sup>st</sup>, 1989, Dr Fuller wrote several letters to this author. In one letter, dated September 25<sup>th</sup> 1985, he said *“So many Christians are being blinded in the glare of scholarship...Satan hates the KJV and he will raise unshirted hell to try and deceive Christians...NO OTHER VERSION HAS EVER TRIGGERED A MIGHTY REVIVAL OR EVEN A SMALL ONE”*.

That is a key observation. P. G. Johnstone<sup>199 p 53</sup> wrote of Great Britain in 1978, somewhat prophetically. His comments have application to all English-speaking nations that once were blessed by belief in the AV1611 as the pure word of God, including the US.

*“The political and economic tensions have become so great that the disintegration of the whole country is not impossible. In similar national crises in the past, God has graciously sent revival, as in the time of Wesley. There has been a national revival every century for the past 800 years, but the revival for this century is overdue. Pray for it.”*

The 20<sup>th</sup> century came and went. The revival never happened, in spite of the availability of the modern versions. Yet the revivals in the previous centuries all stemmed from the ministry of the AV1611 and its faithful precursors, the pre-1611 bibles. (If it is objected that the Wycliffe Bible is based on Jerome’s Vulgate that White thinks God has blessed, i.e. not of the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible pedigree but having a significant part in these early revivals, it can be shown that Wycliffe had access not only to the Old Latin<sup>8 p 21</sup> but also to Hebrew manuscripts for the Old Testament<sup>39 Chapters 21, 22, p 873</sup>. Wycliffe’s editors, John Purvey and Nicholas of Hereford, introduced changes under duress to Wycliffe’s Bible in conformity with Vulgate but this version in its uncorrupted form is rightly considered to be one of the AV1611’s faithful precursors.)

Rev. M. J. Roberts<sup>8 p 317-318</sup>, editor of *The Banner of Truth Magazine* and minister of Greyfriars Free Church in Inverness, Scotland, made this telling statement. This quote is from his address published in the TBS *Quarterly Record*, No. 529, October to December 1994. His words are just as applicable to the present time, if not more so.

*“The Bible is a lost book in Britain today. It has little influence on national life any more...We have to admit that we are not seeing souls converted in great numbers. It does not matter where you go. Go to Wales, to Scotland, or to England here. Few are being converted in these days. Where are the days when the Bible was being blessed to the conversion of thousands and ten thousands?...The problem is here. This book is not being read so as to bring light to bear upon men’s lives. Therefore the tragedy is that men are not being converted to Christ. Could any curse in this life be greater? Could any judgment be more awful than this?”*

This is the judgment that has befallen Great Britain *in spite of* the availability of the modern versions. The same could be said of any of the English-speaking nations, including the USA. Contrary to James White's opinion, it is clearly "*spiritually dangerous*" to spurn the AV1611 and "*historically untenable*" to insist otherwise.

Turning to God's actual blessing of the AV1611, The words of evangelist Billy Sunday<sup>8 p 102</sup> ring down the decades.

*"When the Bible (AV1611) says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go plumb to the Devil!"*

Despite his highly unorthodox attitude and 'offensive' manner, "*Billy Sunday saw over 1,000,000 men and women "hit the sawdust trail" in open profession of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*", according to the paper *How Great Soul winners Were Endued with Power*, by Dr Rev Ian Paisley.

How many souls have the ministries of the modern versions saved by comparison? Not many, according to Rev Roberts. Where is White's evidence that proves the opposite? It is certainly not in his book.

Note further the acknowledged pre-eminence of the AV1611 in times past when this Book was believed and preached throughout the English-speaking nations, according to some unlikely sources. Underlinings are this author's,

*"In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God"* – George Bernard Shaw<sup>8 General Introduction</sup>.

How is it that no modern version has ever replaced the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible in this respect?

Yet another distinguished witness, William Lyon Phelps<sup>200</sup>, Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale University, said this.

*"We Anglo-Saxons have a better Bible than the French or Germans or the Italians or the Spanish; our English translation is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek. There is only one way to explain this; I have no theory to account for the so-called "inspiration of the Bible," but I am confident that the Authorized Version was inspired.*

*"Now as the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world, and as it is the most beautiful monument ever erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who can read. This means that we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use the Authorized Version; all others are inferior. And, except for special purposes, it should be used exclusively in private reading. Why make constant companions of the second best, when the best is available?"*

Contemporary historian David Starkey<sup>201</sup> has said this about the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

*"The King James Version of the bible, more than any other book, formed the English language and shaped the English mind."*

Why has no modern version even approached, let alone equaled or surpassed this achievement, if, as James White<sup>3 p 7</sup> insists, "*multiple translations*" are superior to the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible?

Though not a bible believer himself, journalist and essayist H. L. Mencken<sup>202</sup>, 1880-1956, is said to be “regarded as one of the most influential American writers and prose stylists of the first half of the 20th century.”

He said this<sup>25 p viii</sup> about the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

*“It is the most beautiful of all the translations of the Bible; indeed, it is probably the most beautiful piece of writing in all the literature. Many attempts have been made to purge it of its errors and obscurities...many learned but misguided men have sought to produce translations that should be mathematically accurate, and in the plain speech of everyday. But the Authorized Version has never yielded to any of them, for it is palpably and overwhelmingly better than they are...”*

Somehow, God has never honoured any attempts “to purge it of its errors and obscurities” in four centuries. How would James White explain this testimony of history?

White would probably reject out of hand the following testimonies with respect to the effectiveness of the AV1611 on the mission field, i.e. God’s spectacular blessing, because they have been compiled by Dr Ruckman but he is simply reporting what others have said, without his having made any particular effort to ‘promote’ the AV1611. Note again that White has little or nothing to say about missionary effort in his book.

Dr Peter S. Ruckman<sup>203</sup> states, his emphases.

*“If God wanted to reach the **whole** world in the Tribulation, through Jewish evangelists (Rev. 7: Paul, Jonah and Jeremiah were types) He would use the English-speaking Jews. He wouldn’t touch “the original Greek” with a ten-foot bamboo pole. The “second language” that ninety percent of the countries on this globe choose, if they can choose one, is ENGLISH, as the AV (1611).*

*“**On the mission field** - ! What do we find on the mission field? I will tell you. I am not an expert. I have only been on eight foreign mission fields, but I do have forty-one young men that I personally trained, who are on seventeen different fields, and they preach regularly on the street in eight different languages. That will be Russian, Spanish, Greek, French, German, Italian, Chinese and Ilongo (a Filipino dialect)...*

*“**In India**, a converted Hindu or Moslem cannot join Jacob Chelli’s church (he has established more than forty Baptist churches in India) until he agrees to the position taken by Dr Edward F. Hills on the King James Bible as stated in *The King James Version Defended*.*

*“When I taught 950 Indian pastors (six hours a day for five days), I used nothing but a King James Bible. I never made reference to one Greek word in ANY Greek manuscript, although I have always had access to all of the information found in the textual studies of Kenyon, Miller, Hoskier, Scrivener, Wilkinson, Pickering, Hills, Burgon, and Robertson. That would be about 300,000 notes on Greek words and letters, for it would include all of the critical apparatus in Nestle’s Greek Testament published between 1898 and 1998.*

*“**In Romania** the Romanians told Brother Landolt (one of our missionaries), “Your Bible is better than our Bible.” They volunteered this after studying under him three months. In that time he made NO attempt to convert them from their translations to his.*

*“**In the Ukraine**, my interpreter (Major Taras – a PhD formerly in the Russian Army) said, “Your Bible is better than ours.” He said this after translating fifteen services for me on the street, in church buildings, and in KGB prisons.*

*“In the Philippines, the native pastors criticized me for even suggesting that the AV be translated into the eighty-plus dialects of the Philippine Islands. “Why divide the Body of Christ when ENGLISH will be the language we will have to learn to get along with the Chinese and Japanese businessmen who are taking over our country? And it is the language THEY will have to learn, rather than learn eighty-plus dialects!”*

*“Rudiger Hemmer, a native German, pasturing a German-speaking church tells me that Luther needs revising over and over again in the Old Testament where his translation fails to match up to King James’ readings. That is a native German who was raised on the SECOND BEST translation the world has ever read: Luther’s Heilige Schrift [the Holy Scripture].”*

Note again Dr Mrs Riplinger’s<sup>39 p 456ff</sup> explanation, supported by numerous examples, of how even the AV1611 word endings, altered by modern translations, match those of bibles in other languages, materially assisting those on the mission field, her emphases. See also **Chapter 5**.

*“Jesus Christ, “the Word” and even “the ending” letter (Rev. 1:8) speaks and spells words in similar ways to the Greek, English, German, French, Italian, and Hebrew (Yiddish). The KJV is the only English Bible that speaks and spells like all of these language groups. Wise missionaries love the KJV...*

*“The amazing thing about the KJV’s ‘est’ and ‘eth’ endings is that they **match** the verb endings in most of the languages of the world. These **too** have an ‘s’ in the second person and a ‘t’ in the third person verb endings! The KJV’s ‘becamest’ is wurdest’ in **Modern German**...*

*“New Versions do **not** match the world’s languages. The KJV is international English and is God’s bridge to reach a world now clamouring to learn English.”*

*“Those who speak Greek, German, Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Yiddish and many other languages know that an ‘s’ in the ending means **second person** singular. The use of a ‘t’ in the ending also signals the **third person** to many.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>33 p 288-9</sup> also cites from history over 20 examples of prominent believers in and preachers of the AV1611, whose achievements were of lasting significance, the equivalent of which is yet to be matched by followers of the modern versions. Dr Ruckman’s list includes Peter Spener, 1635-1705, whose work was instrumental in the conversion of John Wesley, David Brainerd, 1718-1747, missionary to the Delaware Indians and George Frederick Handel, 1685-1759, composer of *The Messiah*, in addition to evangelists who brought in the Great Awakening in US during the 18<sup>th</sup> century and several outstanding pioneer missionaries.

White’s next question is whether or not *“we all have to know Greek and Hebrew to really know God’s Word.”*

White’s substantive point in answer to this question is that it is not necessary *“to know Greek and Hebrew to really know God’s Word”* because *“English-speaking people today have access to the best translations that have ever existed, and by diligent comparisons of these translations any English-speaking person can study and know God’s Word [still unidentified between two covers].”*

By inspection, White’s answer excludes the AV1611 *“the best translations that have ever existed”* because these are evidently only available *“today,”* not in the year 1611.

Furthermore, White's answer appears to exclude non-English-speaking persons from satisfactorily knowing God's word and prompts a further reminder of Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>96 p 92-3</sup> scathing denunciation, already referenced in **Chapters 5, 6, 9**.

*"It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one. Four million dollars was invested in the New King James Version; subsequent to that; several million dollars was spent on advertising campaigns. Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation."*

But note that *"the best translations that have ever existed"* are not necessarily without error. This extract from Will Kinney's<sup>173</sup> comments on Acts 19:2 in the previous chapter likewise has a significant bearing on White's assertion above.

*"The simple fact is, Mr. James White does not believe "the Bible" exists that does not contain errors. He even corrects his own NASB. The only "inerrant Bible" James believes in is the imaginary and mystical bible he keeps making up as he goes along, and his "bible" differs from everybody else's.*

*"On page 238 Mr. White says: "I fully believe the Word of God IS INERRANT." The truth is Mr. White does not believe there is such a thing as the inerrant words of God in any Bible or any single text in any language anywhere on this earth. His real position is that ONLY the non-existent and never seen by him "originals WERE inspired and inerrant", but James has no such thing NOW, and he knows it. For James White to SAY he believes in something HE KNOWS does not exist, and cannot show to anyone alive today, is not (in his own words) "to follow the truth to its logical conclusions". Not one time in his entire book does Mr. White ever tell the reader where they can find for themselves a copy of "the inerrant word of God" he says he fully believes in.*

*"Throughout his book Mr. White criticizes the King James Bible and recommends instead three different modern bible translations he calls "reliable versions" - the NKJV, NASB and the NIV. Yet these three "reliable versions", especially the NKJV when compared to the NIV, NASB, differ from each other in literally thousands of words, and hundreds of verses.*

*"The NKJV is generally based (though not always) on the Traditional Greek Text that underlies the King James Bible, but the NASB, NIV omit some 3000 words and many whole verses in just the New Testament that are found in his recommended NKJV. In addition to this, both the NASB and NIV frequently reject the Hebrew texts (but not always in the same places) and follow instead the Syriac, LXX, Vulgate, or else flat out "make up" different readings. I can prove every one of these allegations. Yet Mr. White calls these three multiple-choice, contradictory and conflicting bibles "reliable translations". Never once does he refer to anything on paper and ink bound between two covers as "the inerrant word of God."*"

See also Will Kinney's comments on Acts 28:12-13 in the previous chapter and note that significant textual differences exist between different editions of the NIV<sup>3 p 335</sup>. The current online NIV omits **"begotten"** from John 1:14, 18, 3:16, 18, Acts 13:33, Hebrews 1:5, 5:5, 1 John 4:19 but a Gideon NIV edition exists that re-inserts **"begotten"** into each of these verses. How can the NIV be among *"the best translations that have ever existed"* if such significant differences exist between different editions, especially when the NIV has

recently been augmented by the TNIV, *Today's New International Version*? Does this mean that 'yesterday's' editions have now been superseded? White doesn't discuss these questions.

Moreover, White's answer has again evaded his own question. Although he claims that it is possible by means of "*the best translations that have ever existed*" to "*study and know God's Word*," his question is, whether or not it is necessary "*to know Greek and Hebrew to really know God's Word*." And White<sup>3 p 48</sup> has stated earlier with respect to textual variants in the "*Greek and Hebrew*" that, "*One of those variant readings is the original [or is assumed to be]. We are called to invest our energies in discovering which one it is.*" See **Chapter 3**.

If this is the case, White fails to explain how comparisons of "*the best translations*" in *English* will identify "*the original*" from variants in "*Greek and Hebrew*" manuscripts.

The view of 'our critic'<sup>8 p 104</sup> with respect to knowing Greek and Hebrew "*to really know God's Word*" shows that he disagrees with James White's answer in this part of his book<sup>3 p 248</sup>. 'Our critic's' full statement in this respect is as follows. Underlinings are this author's.

"I should explain that *I accept the NIV as the most accurate translation available at present*, but that does not mean that I accept it uncritically or that I am entirely happy with all its readings. *This version like every other must be subject to the original languages which I constantly consult.*"

Usually, White 'prefers' the NASV in his book. 'Our critic' 'prefers' the NIV.

White denies that a knowledge of Greek and Hebrew is necessary to "*study and know*" *God's Word*," but he is unclear about whether or not such knowledge is necessary "*to really know God's Word*." 'Our critic' insists that such knowledge is necessary for that purpose.

Which authority are "*English-speaking people today*" supposed to believe and why? The answer to this question is made more challenging when it is found that "*the best translations*" include various 'DIYVs – Do It Yourself Versions' – see Will Kinney's comments above - compiled by consultants of "*the original languages*," who cannot agree amongst themselves about what is "*the most accurate translation*." Note Dr Gipp's experience<sup>31 p 126</sup>, his emphases.

*"A self-impressed Bible scholar...was reading Romans 8. Upon reading a particular verse, he stopped at a particular word and stated, "Now the King James translators mis-translated the Greek word used here." Then he spent 10-12 minutes expounding on the merits of **his** choice of translation...*

*"The very next day I was listening to another preacher on the radio. Coincidentally this zealot was also reading from Romans chapter 8. He **also** read the same verse and **ALSO** stopped at the very same word that the expert from the previous evening had accosted. He then stated, "Sadly, the King James translators did not properly translate the Greek word used here"...*

*"But...**this** particular scholar pointed out that the word in question should have been translated an entirely different way...*

*"He than, as the previous evening's butcher, expounded on the virtues of **HIS** choice over that of the King James translators, **or** last evening's expert. I was amazed! Two completely different men, two entirely different opinions. In fact, their **only** point of agree-*

ment was that the **Bible** could not possibly be **correct** as it was. I quickly consigned their esteemed (and humble) opinions to the garbage heap of education and accepted the choice that **GOD** had made for His Book in 1611." A wise decision.

The Earl of Shaftesbury<sup>8 p 45-6</sup> had in 1856 a much more realistic view of "the best translations" than either James White or 'our critic.'

"When you are confused or perplexed by a variety of versions, you would be obliged to go to some learned pundit [e.g. James White, Doug Kutilek, 'our critic' etc.] in whom you reposed confidence, and ask him which version he recommended; and when you had taken his version, you must be bound by his opinion. I hold this to be the greatest danger that now threatens us. It is a danger pressed upon us from Germany, and pressed upon us by the neological spirit of the age. I hold it to be far more dangerous than Tractarianism, or Popery, both of which I abhor from the bottom of my heart. This evil is tenfold more dangerous, tenfold more subtle than either of these, because you would be ten times more incapable of dealing with the gigantic mischief that would stand before you."

See Dr Gipp's 7-fold observations above for an accurate summary of "the gigantic mischief." Note also Dr Ruckman's<sup>33 p 224-6</sup> account of a meeting between a young bible student, the student's Greek teacher and himself. Dr Ruckman posed several questions to the teacher in the student's hearing about "final authority," to which the academic replied that because "the New Testament was written in Greek...I go right to the source...the BEST text, which admittedly is Nestle's, from Stuttgart, Germany." But when his attention was drawn to the Nestle's Arian reading in John 1:18, "'a proof text for the Jehovah's Witnesses,'" the academic then acknowledged that, Dr Ruckman's emphases, "In places where [Nestle] is **obviously** in error, I do not accept his readings."

The student realised immediately, as he said to Dr Ruckman afterwards, that the teacher's "final authority" was not *any* biblical text, either in Greek or English. His "final authority" was *his own opinion*.

Now this academic had stated that it was necessary "to go right to the source" i.e. 'the Greek,' "in deciding what a Biblical text says," although as indicated, his source of 'the Greek' depended ultimately on his opinion. James White says that it is *not* necessary to go to 'the Greek' although on occasion he does, where "variant readings" occur – see above. In the end, as Will Kinney<sup>173</sup> has said earlier, *The only "inerrant Bible" James believes in is the imaginary and mystical bible he keeps making up as he goes along, and his "bible" differs from everybody else's.*

Including the one that the academic interviewed by Dr Ruckman compiled, using Nestle plus the corrections to Nestle's text that he thought were necessary. Which one is to be believed and why? Or as Dr David Otis Fuller asked in print back in 1970, *Which Bible?*

Neither White nor any of his fellow bible critics have satisfactorily answered that question since Dr Fuller first asked it.

James White's final question is whether or not the term "KJV Onlyism" is right and proper. White insists that it is, supposedly accurately representing "those who seek to tell others that the King James is the only God-honouring English translation."

As indicated above, White has failed to identify any departure from the AV1611 Text that God Himself has honoured in the last 400 years.

White mentions Dr Mrs Riplinger in a pejorative sense in his answer but again, it would have been helpful to him if he could have humbled himself sufficiently to learn from her researches. See **Chapters 4, 5.**



She states<sup>39 p 560ff</sup>, her emphases ““Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...’”

In short, it can be said of the AV1611, “it is good,” with no exceptions. Certainly none that James White and his fellow travellers have found.

### **Part Two – “The Textual Data”**

White’s<sup>3</sup> p 252-271 next, and last, substantive section in his book is this Part Two where he seeks to provide ‘manuscript evidence’ i.e. “*Textual Data*” to cast doubt on several well-known passages in the AV1611, most of which express major doctrine. See **Appendix, Table A1** for the repeated agreement between White, the NIV and the heretical translations of Rome and Watchtower, JB, NWT with respect to eliminating or altering the AV1611 readings listed in White’s Part Two.

It should be noted especially that White appeals repeatedly to the work of the late Dr Bruce Metzger, former Princeton Theological Seminary professor and editor of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament. See Cloud’s detailed remarks in **Chapter 7** about how “*Metzger questions the authorship, traditional date, and supernatural inspiration of books penned by Moses, Daniel, and Peter, and in many other ways reveals his liberal, unbelieving heart.*” Dr Metzger might therefore well be expected to impugn readings in the AV1611 that embody major doctrine.

Some of the verses that follow have been addressed earlier in this work. Indications will be given wherever this is the case.

White’s first attack is on Matthew 6:13 and Luke 11:2, 4.

White claims that the last half of Matthew 6:13, “***For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.***” is an example of “*scribal expansion*” and “*later origin*,” with variations in some manuscripts that White describes as ““*variant cluster*”...*a sure sign of later addition.*”

The NIV omits the last half of Matthew 6:13, with support indicated by White from uncials 8, B, Z, D, 0170, Family 1, cursives 205 (probably 209, see below), 547, Old Latin 1, “*many Latin translations and numerous Fathers.*” White quotes Metzger as stating that ““*The absence of any ascription [reading] in early and important [not according to Dean Burgon, who collated them, see Chapter 3] representatives of the Alexandrian (8, B), the Western (D and most of the Old Latin), and the pre-Caesarean ([Family 1<sup>9</sup> p 27]) types of text, as well as early patristic commentaries on the Lord’s Prayer (those of Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian), suggests that an ascription, usually in a threefold form, was composed (perhaps on the basis of 1 Chr 29:11-13) in order to adapt the Prayer for liturgical use in the early church.*””

Dr Hills’s<sup>65</sup> p 110 comment is an appropriate response to Dr Metzger’s speculative use of the term “*suggests.*” See **Chapter 5**.

“*This suggestion leads to conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent. It would have us believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the True Text was not restored until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope’s library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a waste basket on Mt. Sinai, and when Westcott and Hort were providentially guided to construct a theory of it which ignores God’s special providence and treats the text of the New Testament like the text of any other ancient book.*”

Support for the last half of Matthew 6:13 is considerable. Although Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits it, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all include it. This author’s earlier work<sup>8</sup> p 58-60 summarises the evidence as follows, with updated references.

“*Fuller*<sup>77</sup> p 108, citing Burgon, states that of more than 500 relevant (Greek) manuscripts, all but nine contain the AV1611 reading. Hills<sup>65</sup> p 118, 110 p 146, states that uncials B, Aleph,

*D, Z and 6 cursives omit the words, together with 9 manuscripts of the Old Latin and all of Jerome's Vulgate. The TBS [article] The Power and the Glory have an extremely detailed compilation on this text as follows:*

*"Evidence for the authenticity of the AV1611 reading:*

- 1<sup>st</sup> Century: 2 Timothy 4:18b (cross reference)*
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Century: Didache (document of Apostolic Teaching, discovered 1875,<sup>110 p 117</sup>), Tatian's Diatessaron, Old Syriac version (Peshitta)*
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Century: Coptic and Sahidic (i.e. Egyptian) versions*
- 4<sup>th</sup> Century: Apostolic Constitutions, Old Latin manuscript k, Gothic (Ulfilas<sup>18 p 208</sup>) and Armenian versions*
- 5<sup>th</sup> Century: Uncial W, Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium<sup>65 p 147</sup>, Georgian version*
- 6<sup>th</sup> Century: Uncials Sigma, Phi; Ethiopic version; Palestinian, Harclean and Curetonian Syriac<sup>65 p 118</sup>*
- 8<sup>th</sup> Century: Uncials E, L*
- 9<sup>th</sup> Century: Uncials G, K, M, U, V, Delta, Phi, Pi; Old Latin f, g; Cursives 33, 565, 892*
- 10<sup>th</sup> Century: Cursive 1079*
- 11<sup>th</sup> Century: Cursives 28, 124, 174, 230, 700, 788, 1216*
- 12<sup>th</sup> Century: Cursives 346, 543, 1010, 1071, 1195, 1230, 1241, 1365, 1646*
- 13<sup>th</sup> Century: Cursives 13, 1009, 1242, 1546*
- 14<sup>th</sup> Century: Cursives 2148, 2174*
- 15<sup>th</sup> Century: Cursives 69, 1253.*

*"The TBS (ibid.) states that the majority of the "very numerous" Byzantine copies, including lectionaries, contain the AV1611 reading.*

*"The evidence against the AV1611 reading is as follows:*

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Century: Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian, who all fail to mention the words - as do later writers listed below.*
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Century: Some Coptic manuscripts*
- 4<sup>th</sup> Century: Aleph, B, Old Latin a, Caesarius Nazarene, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nyssa, Hilary*
- 5<sup>th</sup> Century: Uncial D, Old Latin b, h; Chromatius, Augustine*
- 6<sup>th</sup> Century: Uncials Z, 0170\*. \*Given in error as a cursive in the earlier work.*
- 7<sup>th</sup> Century: Old Latin l*
- 9<sup>th</sup> Century: Old Latin g2*
- 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Old Latin ff.*
- 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Cursive 1, 118, Lectionary 547, Old Latin c*
- 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Cursives 131, 209, 17, 130."*

The weight of evidence clearly favours the AV1611 and it is therefore not surprising that Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth all<sup>62</sup> omit the last half of Matthew 6:13. Nestle and the RV also omit the words.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 63</sup> summarises the evidence in favour of the AV1611 reading as including up to 19 uncials where Matthew 6 is extant, E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, W, Δ, Θ, Π, Σ, Φ, Ω,

047, 055, 0211, 0248, the majority of cursives and Family 13<sup>9 p 27</sup>, i.e. including cursives 13, 69, 124, 230, 346, 543, 788, 826, 828, 983, 1689, 1709, the first 7 of which are listed above, plus up to 5 Old Latin witnesses, f, g1 (definite), δ, k, q (with variation, which White obviously pounced on, see above), the Peshitta Syriac and the Gothic, see above. Dr Moorman lists uncials Ɑ, B, D, Z, 0170 against the AV1611, Family 1 i.e. cursives 1, 118, 131, 209 and 1-2 others, see above, a few additional cursives, i.e. 3 according to the TBS, 17, 130, 547, see above.

Dr Moorman also lists 9 Old Latin witnesses and the Vulgate against the AV1611, which is why White can refer to “*many Latin translations*” in this respect. Dr Moorman notes with respect to the significance of the omission of the last half of Matthew 6:13 that, “*Any thought of a literal kingdom on earth as foretold in the O.T. has been banished from “mainline” religious thought since the 4<sup>th</sup> century.*”

White<sup>3 p 40</sup> is clearly wrong when he claims that “*No textual variants in either the Old or New Testaments in any way, shape, or form materially disrupt or destroy any essential doctrine of the Christian faith. That is a fact that any semi-impartial review will substantiate.*” Perhaps White should conduct a fully “*impartial review*” of these matters.

Dr Holland<sup>55 p 144-6</sup> has these comments on Matthew 6:13 and reveals additional sources in support of the AV1611. Note his refutation of White’s appeal to “*variant clusters.*”

“*Matthew 6:13:...*

“*The argument raised concerning this text centers around the last half of the verse, “For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen” ...Modern scholarship argues the passage is not genuine because it exists in various forms and is not harmonized in all of its citations. White states, “This kind of ‘variant cluster’ is a sure sign of a later addition.” (White, 252.) Bruce Metzger, as does White, argues the passage is a harmonistic corruption by scribes to unify the text with Luke 11:2-4 (Bruce M. Metzger, The Text Of The New Testament, 2nd ed. [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1973], 197.).*

“*Neither argument is substantive. To argue “variant clusters” is a lack of authenticity is to argue against the critical texts supported by modern scholarship. A review of either the United Bible Societies text or the Nestle-Aland text reveals a vast host of variant readings which modern scholarship supports. As was cited by the Greek Orthodox Study Bible, critical texts depend greatly on Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus which, “often disagree with one another.” (The Orthodox Study Bible, xi.) The argument for harmonization of Matthew 6 with Luke 11 is conjectural. This is revealed by Kurt Aland in his comment on the passage by asking, “...if the doxology originally stood in the gospel of Matthew, who would have deleted it?” (Aland, 306.) Questions and speculations do not alter the textual facts on this passage. While it is omitted in Alexandrian manuscripts such as Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Cantabrigiensis [Codex D], it is found in a host of other sources.*

“*Among the Greek uncials it is found in K (ninth century), L (eighth century), W (fifth century), Dabs [not to be confused with Codex D of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, Cantabrigiensis] (ninth century), Q (ninth century), and P (ninth century). It is found in the following Greek minuscules: 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2174 (dating from the ninth to the twelfth century). However, it is not without early witness. It is found in the Old Latin, the Old Syrian, and some Coptic versions (such as Coptic Bohairic).*

*“Old Latin texts, such as Codices Monacensis (q-seventh century) and Brixianus (f-sixth century), read, “et ne nos inducas in temptationem. sed libera nos a malo. quoniam tuum est regnum. et uirtus. et gloria in saecula. amen.”*

*“The Syriac Peshitto (second to third century) reads, “And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever: Amen.” (James Murdock, The Syriac New Testament from the Peshitto Version [Boston: H. L. Hastings, 1896], 9.)*

*“John Chrysostom cites the verse in the fourth century. In his Homilies this blessed Saint writes, “...by bringing to our remembrance the King under whom we are arrayed, and signifying him to be more powerful than all. ‘For thine,’ saith he, ‘is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory.’” (St. Chrysostom, “Homily XIX,” in The Preaching of Chrysostom, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan [Philadelphia: Fortress Press], 145.)*

*“The oldest witness, which outdates all Greek manuscripts on this passage, is the Didache. Otherwise known as the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, this ancient catechism dates to the early second century, some dating it shortly after 100 AD. In it we have a form of the Lord’s Prayer which supports the reading found in the Traditional Text.”*

Dr Hills<sup>65 p 147-150</sup> provides further insights into Matthew 6:13 in the AV1611. His analysis refutes both White’s notion about “variant clusters” and Metzger’s speculation about scribes using 1 Chronicles 29:11 in order to concoct Matthew 6:13b.

*“The Conclusion Of The Lord’s Prayer (Matt. 6:13b)*

*“Modern English versions are “rich in omissions,” (to borrow a phrase from Rendel Harris)...Time and again the reader searches in them for a familiar verse only to find that it has been banished to the footnotes. And one of the most familiar of the verses to be so treated is Matt. 6:13b, the doxology with which the Lord’s Prayer concludes.*

***“(a) External Evidence in Favor of Matt. 6:13b***

*“For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever, Amen (Matt. 6:13b). This conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer is found in almost all the Greek New Testament manuscripts (according to Legg...in all but ten), including W (4th or 5th century) and Sigma and Phi (both 6th century). It is also found in the Apostolic Constitutions...a 4th century document, and receives further support from Chrysostom (345-407)...who comments on it and quotes it frequently, and from Isidore of Pelusiurn (370-440)...who quotes it. But, in spite of this indisputable testimony in its favor, it is universally rejected by modern critics. Is this unanimous disapproval in accord with the evidence?*

***“(b) Is the Conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer a Jewish Formula?***

*“Matt. 6: 13b is usually regarded as a Jewish prayer-formula that the early Christians took up and used to provide a more fitting termination for the Lord’s Prayer, which originally, it is said, ended abruptly with but deliver us from evil. According to W. Michaelis (1948), for example, “It (Matt. 6:13b) is obviously modelled after Jewish prayer-formulas, cf. 1 Chron 29:11”...*

*“This seems, however a most improbable way to account for the conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer. For if the early Christians had felt the need of something which would provide a smoother ending to this familiar prayer, would they deliberately have selected for that purpose a Jewish prayer-formula in which the name of Jesus does not appear? Even a slight study of the New Testament reveals the difficulty of this hypothesis, for if there was one thing in which the early Christians were united it was in their emphasis on the name*

of Jesus. Converts were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38); miracles were performed in this name (Acts 4:10); by this name alone was salvation possible (Acts 4:12); early Christians were known as those who “called upon this name” (Acts 9:21). Paul received his apostleship “for the sake of His name” (Rom. 1:5), and John wrote his Gospel in order that the readers “might have life through His name” (John 20:31). Is it probable then, (is it at all possible) that these primitive Christians, who on all other occasions were ever mindful of their Saviour’s name, should have forgotten it so strangely when selecting a conclusion for a prayer which they regarded as having fallen from His lips? Can it be that they deliberately decided to end the Lord’s Prayer with a Jewish formula which makes no mention of Christ?

“It is a fact, however, that the Lord’s Prayer concludes with a doxology in which the name of Christ is not mentioned. Can this surprising fact be explained? Not, we repeat, on the supposition that this conclusion is spurious. For if the early Christians had invented this doxology or had adopted it from contemporary non-Christian usage, they would surely have included in it or inserted into it their Saviour’s name. There is therefore only one explanation of the absence of that adorable name from the concluding doxology of the Lord’s Prayer, and this is that this doxology is not spurious but a genuine saying of Christ, uttered before He had revealed unto His disciples His deity and so containing no mention of Himself. At the time He gave this model prayer He deemed it sufficient to direct the praises of His followers toward the Father, knowing that as they grew in their comprehension of the mysteries of their faith their enlightened minds would prompt them so to adore Him also. And the similarity of this doxology to 1 Chron. 29:11 is quite understandable. Might not the words which David used in praise of God be fittingly adapted to the same purpose by One who knew Himself to be the messianic Son of David?

**“(c) The Testimony of the Ancient Versions and of the Didache**

“The concluding doxology of the Lord’s Prayer is not without considerable testimony in its favor of a very ancient sort. It is found in three Syriac versions, the Peshitta, the Harklean, and the Palestinian... It is found...in the Curetonian manuscript, the other representative of the Old Syriac in the following form, *Because Thine is the kingdom and the glory, for ever and ever, Amen.* In the Sahidic [3<sup>rd</sup> century Coptic (Egyptian) text, the oldest manuscript<sup>65 p 119</sup> of which “is variously dated from the mid-4<sup>th</sup> to the 6<sup>th</sup> century”] it runs like this, *Because Thine is the power and the glory, unto the ages, Amen.* And in the Old Latin manuscript *k* (which is generally thought to contain the version in its oldest form) the Lord’s Prayer ends thus, *Because to Thee is the power for ever and ever.* And the doxology is also found in its customary form in four other Old Latin manuscripts.

“Thus the doxology of the Lord’s Prayer occurs in five manuscripts of the Old Latin (including the best one), in the Sahidic, and in all the extant Syriac versions. Normally the agreement of three such groups of ancient witnesses from three separate regions would be regarded as an indication of the genuineness of the reading on which they thus agreed...Hort, however, endeavored to escape the force of this evidence by suggesting that the doxologies found (1) in *k*, (2) in the Sahidic version, (3) in the Syriac versions and the vast majority of the Greek manuscripts were three independent developments which had no connection with each other. But by this suggestion Hort multiplied three-fold the difficulty mentioned above. If it is difficult to believe that the early Christians chose for their most familiar prayer a conclusion which made no mention of Christ it is thrice as difficult to believe that they did this three times independently in three separate regions. Surely it is easier to suppose that these three doxologies are all derived from an

*original doxology uttered by Christ and that the variations in wording are due to the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer, which will be described presently.*

*"The Didache (Teaching) of the Twelve Apostles, a work generally regarded as having been written in the first half of the 2nd century, also bears important witness to the doxology of the Lord's Prayer. This ancient document was not known until 1883, when Bryennios, a Greek Catholic bishop, published it from a copy which he had discovered at Constantinople in 1875. It is a manual of Church instruction in two parts, the first being a statement of Christian conduct to be taught to converts before baptism, and the second a series of directions for Christian worship. Here the following commandment is given concerning prayer. And do not pray as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in His Gospel, pray thus: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, as in heaven so also upon earth; give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debt as we forgive our debtors, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the power and the glory for ever...*

*"Here this early-2nd-century writer claims to have taken this model prayer from the Gospel (of Matthew). Is it not reasonable to believe that he took the whole prayer from Matthew, doxology and all? Who would ever have guessed that this ancient author took the preceding portions of the prayer from Matthew but the doxology from contemporary ecclesiastical usage? Yet this is the strange hypothesis of Michaelis and others who have come to the Didache with their minds firmly made up beforehand to reject the doxology of the Lord's Prayer. In support of his view Michaelis appeals to the absence of the words kingdom and Amen from the Didache, but surely these minor verbal differences are not sufficient to justify his contention that the doxology of the Didache was not taken from Matthew. And perhaps it is permissible to point out once more that if the doxology had been taken from contemporary ecclesiastical usage it would have contained the name of Christ, because the other prayers in the Didache, which were taken from contemporary ecclesiastical usage, all end with a reference to the Saviour.*

#### ***"(d) The Liturgical Use of the Lord's Prayer***

*"But someone may ask why the doxology of the Lord's Prayer is absent from certain New Testament documents if it was actually a portion of the original Gospel of Matthew. An inspection of Legg's critical edition of this Gospel (1940) discloses that the doxology is omitted by Aleph B D S [evidently Z, 6<sup>th</sup> century, S is 10<sup>th</sup> century<sup>9 p 22</sup>] and by six minuscule manuscripts. It is also omitted by all the manuscripts of the Vulgate and by nine manuscripts of the Old Latin. And certain Greek and Latin Fathers omit it in their expositions of the Lord's Prayer. Thus Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine make no mention of it. But these omissions find their explanation in the manner in which the Lord's Prayer was used in the worship services of the early Church.*

*"From very early times the Lord's Prayer was used liturgically in the Church service. This fact is brought home to us by an inspection of C. A. Swainson's volume, *The Greek Liturgies* (1884)...Here the learned author published the most ancient Greek liturgies from the oldest manuscripts available. In the 8th-century Liturgy of St. Basil, after the worshiping people had repeated the body of the Lord's Prayer, the priest concluded it with these words, for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory of the Father, and the people responded, Amen. In two other 8th-century liturgies the wording is the same, except that the doxology repeated by the priest is merely, for Thine is the kingdom. Later the doxologies which the priests were directed to pronounce became more and more elaborate. In the 11th-century Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, after the people had repeated the Lord's Prayer down to the doxology, the priest was to conclude as follows: for*

*Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, now and always, and for ever and ever.*

*“Thus we see that from very earliest times in the worship services of the Church the conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer was separated from the preceding portions of it. The body of the Prayer was repeated by the people, the conclusion by the priest. Moreover, due to this liturgical use, the conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer was altered in various ways in the effort to make it more effective. This, no doubt, was the cause of the minor variations in the doxology which we find in the Didache, the Curetonian Syriac, and the Old Latin manuscript k. And furthermore, a distinction soon grew up between the body of the Lord’s Prayer and the conclusion of it, a distinction which was made more sharp by the occurrence of the Lord’s Prayer in Luke (given by Christ for the second time, on a different occasion) without the concluding doxology. Because the doxology was always separated from the rest of the Lord’s Prayer, it began to be regarded by some Christians as a man-made response and not part of the original prayer as it fell from the lips of Christ. Doubtless for this reason it is absent from the ten Greek manuscripts mentioned above and from most of the manuscripts of the Latin versions. And it may also be for this reason that some of the Fathers do not mention it when commenting on the Lord’s Prayer.”*

White had access to Dr Hills’s book. See **Chapter 5**. Why did he wilfully ignore Dr Hills’s reasoned analysis of Matthew 6:13, in favour of Metzger’s speculations?

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 155-161, 18 p 103</sup> has the following analyses, his emphases.

*“Watch how [White] proceeds, as he carefully avoids **all facts** and simply “ad libs” through a textual problem, relying on his individual idiosyncrasies, and opinionated prejudices, to get by and pass himself off as a “scholar.”*

*““The Lord’s prayer in Matthew 6 is an excellent text for illustrating how scribal expansion took place in the context...vs. 13 provides a **valuable insight** into the habits of scribes, but the many efforts at **harmonizing** Luke’s much abbreviated version [Luke 11:2, 4] [abbreviated by the NASV and NIV] are of great interest as well...the additional material in verse 13 gives us **INDICATIONS** of its **LATER** origin in a **number of ways.**”*

*“Now check him out...”*

1. How **did** “scribal expansion” take place? **No data.**
2. What “valuable insight” did anyone get? **It isn’t given.**
3. Where was the proof that Luke’s original read as the “abbreviated” NASV and NIV [[that] **lopped off nineteen words from [Luke 11:2-4]]**? **No proof given.** Three assertions in one paragraph.
4. Why did you take for granted that the “additional material” in Matthew had been added “later,” when your theory on the **lateness** of the Byzantine readings (see pp 169-172) was shot so full of holes you could fly a DC-10 through it? See **Chapter 3** and this author’s earlier work<sup>8 Chapter 9</sup> for summary material on the ‘Byzantine’ text.
5. A “number of ways,” is it? Why didn’t you give **ONE**?...

*“In clownish hilarity, this superficial critic<sup>3 p 253</sup> says that you can be “disconcerted” when you compare the NIV with the AV if you are not “familiar with the **reasons for the difference.**” Sonny...The “differences” are the differences between a pure text which was breathed upon by the Holy Spirit (1611-1996), and a miserable **counterfeit text**...”*



*“What is the “external evidence” for getting rid of Matthew 6:13? Why it is good old  $\aleph$  and B again: the two manuscripts that contain New Testament Apocrypha (The Shepherd and Barnabus), that omit 1 and 2 Timothy; Titus; Hebrews, chapters 10-13; and the whole book of Revelation; [and] that contain Old Testament, Catholic apocryphal books...*

*“White said “numerous church fathers” sided with  $\aleph$  and B. For example? **Name one...***

*“You want to see those “attempts at harmonization” Jimbo spoke about? **He couldn’t even locate them.**”*

Dr Ruckman then highlights the conflicting readings in the old uncials with respect to Luke 11:2, 4 that Dean Burgon identified and have been remarked upon earlier in this work. See **Summary** and **The Revision Conspiracy**. Burgon’s conclusion bears repeating yet again.

*“The five Old Uncials’ (Aleph A B C D) falsify the Lord’s Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text; and yet they are never able to agree among themselves as to one single various reading; while only once are more than two of them observed to stand together, and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of an article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence.”*

Dr Ruckman also gives further insight – see Dr Hills’s remarks above – into why the whole of Matthew 6:13b was removed from some early manuscripts and versions.

*“Matthew 6:13. All of the ending has been removed in the ASV (1901), so it will match the Roman Catholic Latin Bibles. Jerome removed **“For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever...”** for the simple reason that this was a Jewish prayer given to Jews who were under the Law, **before the Crucifixion**. Jerome (as Origen and Augustine), was a Post-millennialist...he thought the world would get better and better till everybody became a Roman “Christian.” But in Postmillennialism you are taught to spiritualise Revelation 11:15 and omit the **“now”** from John 18:36...and change the tense of **“reign”** (Rev. 5:10). Such a theology will not allow for a restoration of Israel, or the Kingdom returning to the “king of the Jews” seated on the **“throne of David”** to **“reign over the house of Jacob”** (Matt. 19:28, Luke 1:30-33). Therefore, Matthew 6:13 must be altered so the “Kingdom” does **not return to Israel...***

*“Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Eusebius, Calvin, and [Westcott and Hort] (and the ASV, 1901) tore the ending off the prayer and “saved the day” for Post-millennial theology...”*

White<sup>3 p 275</sup> had access to Dr Ruckman’s book. Why did he fail to address this reasoned explanation for the omission of Matthew 6:13b from some texts?

Dean Burgon<sup>131</sup> has an extensive analysis of Matthew 6:13 that decisively refutes the speculations of both White and Metzger. White professes to regard Dean Burgon as one of the “*true scholars of the first rank.*” Why didn’t White check Dean Burgon’s analysis? It is most slipshod of White not to have done so.

*“Indeed, the Ancient Liturgy of the Church has frequently exercised a corrupting influence on the text of Scripture. Having elsewhere considered St. Luke’s version of the Lord’s Prayer<sup>13 p 34-6</sup>, I will in this place discuss the genuineness of the doxology with which the Lord’s Prayer concludes in St. Matt. vi. 13  $\sigma\tau\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \eta\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \delta\upsilon\ \nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \delta\omicron\zeta\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\ \nu\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\mu\eta\nu.$  — words which for 360 years have been re-*

jected by critical writers as spurious, notwithstanding St. Paul's unmistakable recognition of them in 2 Tim. iv. 18, — which alone, one would have thought, should have sufficed to preserve them from molestation.

"The essential note of primitive antiquity at all events these fifteen words enjoy in perfection, being met with in all copies of the Peshitto:— and this is a far weightier consideration than the fact that they are absent from most of the Latin copies. Even of these however four (k f g<sup>l</sup> q) recognize the doxology, which is also found in Cureton's Syriac and the Sahidic version; the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, Slavonic, Harkleian, Palestinian, Erpenius' Arabic, and the Persian of Tawos; as well as in the *Διδαχη* (with variations) [Didache – See Dr Hills's comments above]; Apostolical Constitutions (iii. 18–vii. 25 with variations); in St. Ambrose (*De Sacr.* vi. 5. 24), Caesarius (*Dial.* i. 29). Chrysostom comments on the words without suspicion, and often quotes them (*In Orat. Dom.*, also see Horn. in *Matt. xiv. 13*): as does Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.* iv. 24). See also *Opus Imperfectum* (*Hom.* in *Matt. xiv*), Theophylact on this place, and Euthymius Zigabenus (in *Matt. vi. 13* and *C. Massal. Anath.* 7). And yet their true claim to be accepted as inspired is of course based on the consideration that they are found in ninety-nine out of a hundred of the Greek copies, including Φ and Σ of the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth centuries. What then is the nature of the adverse evidence with which they have to contend and which is supposed to be fatal to their claims?

"Four uncial MSS. (αBDZ), supported by five cursives of bad character (I, 17 which gives αμην ["*amen*"], 118, 130, 209), and, as we have seen, all the Latin copies but four, omit these words; which, it is accordingly assumed, must have found their way surreptitiously into the text of all the other copies in existence. But let me ask, — Is it at all likely, or rather is it any way credible, that in a matter like this, all the MSS. in the world but nine should have become corrupted? No hypothesis is needed to account for one more instance of omission in copies which exhibit a mutilated text in every page. But how will men pretend to explain an interpolation universal as the present; which may be traced as far back as the second century; which has established itself without appreciable variety of reading in all the MSS.; which has therefore found its way from the earliest time into every part of Christendom; is met with in all the Lectionaries, and in all the Greek Liturgies; and has so effectually won the Church's confidence that to this hour it forms part of the public and private devotions of the faithful all over the world?

"One and the same reply has been rendered to this inquiry ever since the days of Erasmus. A note in the Complutensian Polyglott (1514) expresses it with sufficient accuracy. 'In the Greek copies, after *And deliver us from evil*, follows *For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever*. But it is to be noted that in the Greek liturgy, after the choir has said *And deliver us from evil*, it is the Priest who responds as above: and those words, according to the Greeks, the priest alone may pronounce. This makes it probable that the words in question are no integral part of the Lord's Prayer: but that certain copyists inserted them in error, supposing, from their use in the liturgy, that they formed part of the text.' In other words, they represent that men's ears had grown so fatally familiar with this formula from its habitual use in the liturgy, that at last they assumed it to be part and parcel of the Lord's Prayer. The same statement has been repeated ad nauseam by ten generations of critics for 360 years. The words with which our Saviour closed His pattern prayer are accordingly rejected as an interpolation resulting from the liturgical practice of the primitive Church. And this slipshod account of the matter is universally acquiesced in by learned and unlearned readers alike at the present day.

*“From an examination of above fifty ancient oriental liturgies, it is found then that though the utmost variety prevails among them, yet that not one of them exhibits the evangelical formula as it stands in St. Matt. vi. 13; while in some instances the divergences of expression are even extraordinary. Subjoined is what may perhaps be regarded as the typical eucharistic formula, derived from the liturgy which passes as Chrysostom’s. Precisely the same form recurs in the office which is called after the name of Basil: and it is essentially reproduced by Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, and pseudo-Caesarius; while something very like it is found to have been in use in more of the Churches of the East.*

*‘For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, now and always and for ever and ever. Amen.’*

*“But as every one sees at a glance, such a formula as the foregoing,—with its ever-varying terminology of praise, — its constant reference to the blessed Trinity, — its habitual νῦν καὶ αἰ [“now and always”], — and its invariable εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, (which must needs be of very high antiquity, for it is mentioned by Irenaeus, and may be as old as 2 Tim. iv. 18 itself;) — the doxology, I say, which formed part of the Church’s liturgy, though transcribed 10,000 times, could never by possibility have resulted in the unvarying doxology found in MSS. of St. Matt. vi. 13, — ‘For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.’*

*“On the other hand, the inference from a careful survey of so many Oriental liturgies is inevitable. The universal prevalence of a doxology of some sort at the end of the Lord’s Prayer; the general prefix ‘for thine’; the prevailing mention therein of ‘the kingdom and the power and the glory’; the invariable reference to Eternity:— all this constitutes a weighty corroboration of the genuineness of the form in St. Matthew. Eked out with a confession of faith in the Trinity, and otherwise amplified as piety or zeal for doctrinal purity suggested, every liturgical formula of the kind is clearly derivable from the form of words in St. Matt. vi. 13. In no conceivable way, on the other hand, could that briefer formula have resulted from the practice of the ancient Church. The thing, I repeat, is simply impossible.*

*“What need to point out in conclusion that the Church’s peculiar method of reciting the Lord’s Prayer in the public liturgy does notwithstanding supply the obvious and sufficient explanation of all the adverse phenomena of the case? It was the invariable practice from the earliest time for the Choir to break off at the words ‘But deliver us from evil.’ They never pronounced the doxology. The doxology must for that reason have been omitted by the critical owner of the archetypal copy of St. Matthew from which nine extant Evangelia, Origen, and the Old Latin version originally derived their text. This is the sum of the matter. There can be no simpler solution of the alleged difficulty. That Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose recognize no more of the Lord’s Prayer than they found in their Latin copies, cannot create surprise. The wonder would have been if they did.*

*“Much stress has been laid on the silence of certain of the Greek Fathers concerning the doxology although they wrote expressly on the Lord’s Prayer; as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa (But the words of Gregory of Nyssa are doubtful. See Scrivener, Introduction, ii. p. 325, note 1.), Cyril of Jerusalem, Maximus. Those who have attended most to such subjects will however bear me most ready witness, that it is never safe to draw inferences of the kind proposed from the silence of the ancients. What if they regarded a doxology, wherever found, as hardly a fitting subject for exegetical comment? But however their silence is to be explained, it is at least quite certain that the reason of it is not because their copies of St. Matthew were unfurnished with the doxology. Does any one seriously*

*imagine that in A. D. 650, when Maximus wrote, Evangelia were, in this respect, in a different state from what they are at present?*

*“The sum of what has been offered may be thus briefly stated:— The textual perturbation observable at St. Matt. vi. 13 is indeed due to a liturgical cause, as the critics suppose. But then it is found that not the great bulk of the Evangelia, but only Codd.  $\delta$ BDZ 1, 17, 118, 130, 209, have been victims of the corrupting influence. As usual, I say, it is the few, not the many copies, which have been led astray. Let the doxology at the end of the Lord’s Prayer be therefore allowed to retain its place in the text without further molestation. Let no profane hands be any more laid on these fifteen precious words of the LORD JESUS CHRIST [Amen to that! ☺].*

*“There yet remains something to be said on the same subject for the edification of studious readers [like every “true Christian scholar”<sup>3 p 247</sup> who “is a lover of truth” should be ☺]; to whom the succeeding words are specially commended. They are requested to keep their attention sustained, until they have read what immediately follows.*

*“The history of the rejection of these words is in a high degree instructive. It dates from 1514, when the Complutensian editors, whilst admitting that the words were found in their Greek copies, banished them from the text solely in deference to the Latin version. In a marginal annotation they started the hypothesis that the doxology is a liturgical interpolation [parroted by Metzger and White]. But how is that possible, seeing that the doxology is commented on by Chrysostom? ‘We presume,’ they say, ‘that this corruption of the original text must date from an antecedent period.’ The same adverse sentence, supported by the same hypothesis, was reaffirmed by Erasmus, and on the same grounds; but in his edition of the N.T. he suffered the doxology to stand. As the years have rolled out, and Codexes DBZ $\delta$  have successively come to light, critics have waxed bolder and bolder in giving their verdict. First, Grotius, Hammond, Walton; then Mill and Grabe; next Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach; lastly Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers have denounced the precious words as spurious.*

*“But how does it appear that tract of time has strengthened the case against the doxology? Since 1514, scholars have become acquainted with the Peshitto version; which by its emphatic verdict, effectually disposes of the evidence borne by all but [four] of the Old Latin copies. The Litbaxi of the first or second century, the Sahidic version of the third century, the Apostolic Constitutions...follow on the same side. Next, in the fourth century come Chrysostom, Ambrose...Caesarius, the Gothic version. After that Isidore, the Ethiopic, Cureton’s Syriac. The Harkleian, Armenian, Georgian, and other versions, with Chrysostom...the Opus Imperfectum, Theophylact, and Euthymius...bring up the rear. Does any one really suppose that two Codexes of the fourth century (B $\delta$ ), which are even notorious for their many omissions and general [in]accuracy, are any adequate set-off against such an amount of ancient evidence? L and 33, generally the firm allies of BD and the Vulgate, forsake them at St. Matt. vi. 13: and dispose effectually of the adverse testimony of D and Z, which are also balanced by  $\Phi$  and  $\Sigma$ . But at this juncture the case for rejecting the doxology breaks down: and when it is discovered that every other uncial and every other cursive in existence may be appealed to in its support, and that the story of its liturgical origin proves to be a myth, — what must be the verdict of an impartial mind on a survey of the entire evidence? [Not the same as White’s<sup>3 p 248</sup> “well-trained mind,” apparently.]*

*“The whole matter may be conveniently restated thus:— Liturgical use has indeed been the cause of a depravation of the text at St. Matt. vi. 13; but it proves on inquiry to be the very few MSS., — not the very many, — which have been depraved.*

*“Nor is any one at liberty to appeal to a yet earlier period than is attainable by existing liturgical evidence; and to suggest that then the doxology used by the priest may have been the same with that which is found in the ordinary text of St. Matthew’s Gospel. This may have been the case or it may not. Meanwhile, the hypothesis, which fell to the ground when the statement on which it rested was disproved, is not now to be built up again on a mere conjecture. But if the fact could be ascertained, — and I am not at all concerned to deny that such a thing is possible, — I should regard it only as confirmatory of the genuineness of the doxology. For why should the liturgical employment of the last fifteen words of the Lord’s Prayer be thought to cast discredit on their genuineness? In the meantime, the undoubted fact, that for an indefinitely remote period the Lord’s Prayer was not publicly recited by the people further than ‘But deliver us from evil,’ — a doxology of some sort being invariably added, but pronounced by the priest alone, — this clearly ascertained fact is fully sufficient to account for a phenomenon so ordinary [found indeed so commonly throughout St. Matthew, to say nothing of occurrences in the other Gospels] as really not to require particular explanation, viz. the omission of the last half of St. Matthew vi. 13 from Codexes  $\alpha$ B $\Delta$ Z.”*

It may be that the words of a dying man, on the edge of eternity, furnish further testimony to the validity of Matthew 6:13b.

Stalingrad, January 1943<sup>204 p 250-1</sup>

*“Dr Ludwig...the padre was engaged in a hopeless attempt to deal with death as a mass phenomenon. He could no longer concern himself with individuals, but was forced to perform his duties almost as a drill. The extreme unction, the Lord’s Prayer, then the next man; for 30,000 dead lay in Gumrak [railway station inside the Stalingrad perimeter].*

*“There was a special room at the main dressing station for those with stomach or head wounds and the hopeless cases would be taken straight from the operation tent ‘to the padre’. The stretcher bearers brought him a man whose face had already been covered with a shroud. The priest pulled back the covering, administered the last rites, for the hundredth time that day, and repeated the Lord’s Prayer. When he had reached the end of the Catholic version, he saw the hands underneath the shroud clasp one another and heard the ‘dead man’ add the Protestant ending: ‘for thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory.’”*

Bible believers will retain “*the Protestant ending.*”

White insists with respect to Luke 11:2, 4 that “*Luke’s version of the Lord’s Prayer is highly abbreviated in its original form [White can give no manuscript evidence for the “original form” of Luke 11:2, 4 but is merely citing Nestle’s opinion<sup>1 p 156</sup>]....Entire phrases are imported into Luke, resulting in a much longer version in the King James Version [again, White gives no evidence to show how this ‘importing’ was carried out and who was responsible]... ”*

White objects to the words “*Our,*” “*which art in heaven,*” “*Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth*” and “*deliver us from evil.*”

White claims that because “*Each of the [above] phrases is found in Matthew’s version of the Lord’s Prayer*” therefore “*The influence of Matthew’s version is seen throughout the*

later Greek manuscripts and hence, in the TR's reading of Luke's account." White adds that, "we find a number of variants [in Luke 11:2-4] as well."

This author's earlier work<sup>8 p 70-1</sup> presents summary evidence in support of Luke 11:2, 4 in the AV1611, with references updated.

#### **"Luke 11:2-4**

**"Our", "which art in heaven", "as in heaven, so in earth" and "but deliver us from evil" have been omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg. [f.n.], NWT, JB.**

**"Burgon<sup>13 p 34-35, 317</sup> states that the modern omissions can be traced back to Marcion the heretic (150 AD). Aleph and B alone omit "but deliver us from evil."**

The modern versions listed also omit **"Thy will be done"** from verse 2.

Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford<sup>62</sup> omit **"Our," "which art in heaven," "Thy will be done," "as in heaven, so in earth"** - Lachmann deems this clause doubtful – and **"but deliver us from evil."**

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits all five expressions but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> each contain all five. All five expressions are also found in pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bibles<sup>39 p 726</sup>, indicating that Wycliffe's New Testament underwent revision. See remarks in **Chapter 8**. Overall, therefore, the pre-1611 bibles bear witness to the authentic text, i.e. the Traditional Text as found in the AV1611, as is confirmed by the following manuscript evidence.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 91</sup> gives in support of **"which art in heaven"** 26-27 uncials; A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, W, X, Xi, Γ, Δ, Θ, Λ, Π, Ψ, Ω, 047, 055, 0211 and possibly 0233, the majority of cursives, the 13+ manuscripts in Family 13 including 13, 69, 124, 230, 346, 543, 788, 826, 828, 983, 1689, 1709, 7 Old Latin sources with no variation and 4 with variation and the Peshitta Syriac.

The same support exists for **"Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth,"** except that ⱼ also contains these clauses and the Old Latin consists of 10 sources with no variation.

The main witnesses against **"which art in heaven"** are P75, ⱼ, B, L, almost no cursives, the 6 (5+) manuscripts of Family 1; 1, 118, 131, 209 etc. and 2-3 Old Latin sources. The main witnesses against **"Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth"** are the same, except weaker, losing ⱼ and the Old Latin sources.

Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 34-35, 317-319</sup> has these detailed comments on Luke 11:2, 4 as it eventuated in the RV from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus – and as found in the later modern version – the Dean's emphases.

*"An instructive specimen of depravation follows, which can be traced to Marcion's mutilated recension of S. Luke's Gospel. We venture to entreat the favour of the reader's sustained attention to the license with which the LORD'S Prayer as given in S. Luke's Gospel (xi. 2-4), is exhibited by codices ⱼ A B C D. For every reason one would have expected that so precious a formula would have been enshrined in the 'old uncials' in peculiar safety; handled by copyists of the IVth, Vth, and VIth centuries with peculiar reverence. Let us ascertain exactly what has befallen it:-*

*"(a) D introduces the LORD'S Prayer by interpolating the following paraphrase of S. Matt. vi 7:- 'Use not vain repetitions as the rest: for some suppose that they shall be heard by their much speaking. But when ye pray'...After which portentous exordium [introduction],*

“(b) B & omit the 5 words, ‘Our’ ‘which art in heaven.’ Then,

“(c) D omits the article...before ‘name:’ and supplements the first petition with the words ‘upon us’... It must needs also transpose the words ‘Thy Kingdom’...

“(d) B in turn omits the third petition, - ‘Thy will be done, as in heaven, also on the earth;’ which 11 words & retains, but adds ‘so’ before ‘also,’ and omits the article..., finding for once an ally in A C D.

“(e) & D for διδου write δοϋ (from Matt. [6:11]) [two different Greek words for “give”].

“(f) & omits the article...before ‘day by day.’ And,

“(g) D, instead of the 3 last-named words writes ‘this day’ (from Matt.): substitutes ‘debts’...for ‘sins’...also from Matt. and in place of ‘for (we) ourselves’...writes ‘as also we’ again from Matt. – But,

“(h) & shows its sympathy with D by accepting two-thirds of this last blunder: exhibiting ‘as also (we) ourselves’...

“(i) D consistently reads ‘our debtors’...in place of ‘every one that is indebted to us’... - Finally,

“(j) B & omit the last petition, - ‘but deliver us from evil’... - unsupported by A C or D...

“So then, these five ‘first class authorities’ are found to throw themselves into **six different combinations** in their departure from S. Luke’s way of exhibiting the LORD’S Prayer, - which, among them, they contrive to falsify in respect of no less than 45 words; and yet **they are never able to agree among themselves as to any single various reading**: while **only once** are more than two of them observed to stand together, - viz. in the unauthorized omission of the article. In respect of 32 (out of 45) words, **they bear in turn solitary evidence**. What need to declare that it is **certainly false** in every instance? Such however is the infatuation of the Critics, that the vagaries of B are all taken for gospel. Besides omitting the 11 words [in Greek] which B omits jointly with &, Drs Westcott and Hort erase from the Book of Life those other 11 precious words which are omitted by B only. And in this way it comes to pass that the mutilated condition to which the scalpel of Marcion the heretic reduced the LORD’S Prayer some 1730 years ago [from the 1880s], (for the mischief can all be traced back to **him!**), is palmed off on the Church of England by the Revisionists as the work of the HOLY GHOST!”

Burgon affirms that, his emphases, “the omission of the last clause of the LORD’S prayer, in Lu. xi. 4” is one of “the [so manifest] disfigurements jointly and **exclusively** exhibited by codices B and &, that instead of accepting these codices as two ‘independent’ Witnesses to the inspired Original, we are constrained to regard them as little more than a single reproduction of one and the same scandalously corrupt and (**comparatively**) late Copy. By consequence, we consider their joint and exclusive attestation of any particular reading, ‘an unique criterion’ of its worthlessness; a sufficient reason – **not** for adopting, but for unceremoniously rejecting it.”

Burgon also notes in this context that Codices B and & “exhibit fabricated Texts” because “No amount of honest **copying**, - persevered in for any number of centuries – could possibly have resulted in two such documents. Separated from one another in actual date by 50, perhaps by 100 years, they must needs have branched off from a common corrupt ancestor, and straightaway become exposed continuously to fresh depraving influences. The result is, that codex &, (which evidently has gone through more adventures and fallen into worse company than his rival,) has been corrupted to a far greater extent than codex

*B, and is even more untrustworthy. Thus whereas (in the Gospels alone) B has 589 Readings quite peculiar to itself, affecting 858 words, - 8 has 1460 such Readings, affecting 2640 words.”*

Codices 8 and B are therefore similar in their departures from the Text of the AV1611 but dissimilar with respect to each other. Since **“God is not the author of confusion”** 1 Corinthians 14:33, He cannot be the Author of 8 and B.

White refers to **“a number of variants”** with respect to Luke 11:2, 4. It is therefore not surprising that White did not discuss these variants in any detail, if he was aware of Burgon’s analysis.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>96 p 52-3, 2007 Edition</sup> has these insights with respect to the shortened version of Luke 11:2, 4.

*“The Lord’s Prayer in Luke 11:2, in the new versions, is believed to be the one created by Marcion, a heretic, in the third century. Early Christians, like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, concluded that Marcion, whom they called “the beast,” was the culprit who created this shortened Lord’s Prayer that we see in the NIV and most new versions today. Heretics did not change what they did not have. Marcion had only the book of Luke and that is what he changed. Occultists, such as Madame Blavatsky, and books, such as The Dogma and Ritual of High Magic, admit that occultists use Marcion’s shortened version to pray to Lucifer. Most new versions, including the NIV’s Lord’s Prayer, have fourteen words taken out relating to heaven. If you’re praying to Lucifer, obviously you cannot have words directing the prayer to heaven. Those all have to come out. The words “deliver us from evil” must also be removed if you are praying to Lucifer.*

*“The Lord’s Prayer, as it occurs in Luke 11:2 in most new versions, occurs in no Greek manuscripts in the world today. The old manuscripts – Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and uncials A, C, and D – omit words and phrases from the Lord’s Prayer in Luke. But none of these read in toto as the new versions do. So, what we have in the NIV...and the NASB, in Luke 11:2, is a Lord’s Prayer that has never existed anywhere other than in what Madame Blavatsky and occultists call their prayer to Lucifer.”*

White<sup>3 p 146, 186</sup> has insisted as section headings in his book that **“NO GRAND CONSPIRACIES”** exist with respect to the modern versions and declared emphatically **“MODERN TEXTS FOUND INNOCENT.”**

Dean Burgon and Dr Mrs Riplinger have shown White to be a liar on both the above counts. He will shown to have lied repeatedly as this study of his Part Two continues.

White’s next attack on the Holy Bible is with respect to the name **“Jesus”** in Matthew 8:29. White’s unscholarly speculations on this reading have been answered in **Chapter 7**.

White<sup>3 p 254</sup> now claims that **“Why callest thou me good?”** in Matthew 19:17 should be **“Why do you ask me about what is good?”** in the NIV because of **“the tendency toward scribal harmonization of parallel accounts, especially in the Synoptic Gospels”** and therefore, in White’s opinion, **“the reading of such witnesses as 8 B L and ̸ should be taken as the best.”**

White’s statement is once again sheer conjecture, with absolutely no evidence in support of it. Note that he omits to mention that the NIV, NASV delete **“that is, God”** from the verse, along with the JB, NWT.



Matthew 19:17 has been discussed earlier in this work and those comments should be reviewed. See **Chapter 4** with respect to Acts 9:5, 6, noting Dr Holland's remarks, **Chapter 5**, with respect to *The Alexandrian Cult*, **Chapter 6**, with respect to 2 Timothy 3:3, noting Dr Hills's evaluation of Matthew 19:17 in the modern versions as "*this stale crumb of Greek philosophy in place of the bread of life,*" **Chapter 7**, with respect to comments on Mark 15:28.

Before specifically addressing Matthew 19:17 further, it is worth returning again to Dr Hills's comment<sup>65 p 110</sup> as it applied to White's notions of 'expansions of piety.' Again, see also **Chapter 5**, with respect to White's attack on Dr Mrs Riplinger.

Dr Hills's comment applies equally to all White's<sup>3 p 252-4</sup> "**vain...imagination**s" Romans 1:21 about "*scribal expansion,*" "*parallel corruption,*" "*scribal harmonization.*" Because he isn't one himself, White has no sense of the faithfulness of true bible believers who would "***stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle***" 2 Thessalonians 2:15b.

*"This suggestion leads to conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent. It would have us believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the True Text was not restored until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope's library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a waste basket on Mt. Sinai, and when Westcott and Hort were providentially guided to construct a theory of it which ignores God's special providence and treats the text of the New Testament like the text of any other ancient book. But if the True New Testament Text was lost for 1500 years, how can we be sure that it has ever been found again?"*

Summary evidence for and against Matthew 19:17 in the AV1611 is as follows<sup>8 p 61-2</sup>. References have been updated.

#### **"Matthew 19:17**

**"Why callest thou me good"** is changed to... "*Why do you ask me about what is good,*" or similar by the RV..., Ne, NIV, NKJV marg. [f.n.], NWT, JB...

*"Hills<sup>65 p 142-143, 110 p 119-120</sup>, states that eleven Greek manuscripts have the modern reading, which is also found in the Old Latin and Old Syriac [Curetonian Syriac<sup>9 p 69</sup>] versions and cited by Origen, Eusebius and Augustine. However, he also states that Uncial W and the vast majority of Greek manuscripts agree with the AV1611, together with the Peshitta and Sahidic versions and the 2<sup>nd</sup> century writers, Irenaeus, Hippolytus and Justin Martyr."*

The reading of the new versions is that of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup>, who again are shown to have influenced Westcott and Hort's RV and Nestle.

Wycliffe, possibly influenced by the Vulgate and/or corrupted Old Latin sources<sup>9 p 69</sup>, follows the modern reading. Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops'<sup>138</sup> all agree with the AV1611 reading.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 69</sup> gives in support of the AV1611, 20-21 uncials; C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Y, Σ, Φ, Ω, and W, Δ with variation, also 047, 055, 0116, 0211, possibly 0233 and possibly P71 of the 4<sup>th</sup> century<sup>9 p 17</sup>. The majority of the cursives and the 13+ manuscripts of Family 13 support the AV1611, as does the Peshitta Syriac and 2 of the Old Latin sources. Against the AV1611 and in favour of the modern reading are Ɑ, the original reading of B with variation, the second corrector of B, L, Θ, D with variation, a few or

none of the cursives, the 6 (5+) manuscripts of Family 1 with variation and 13 Old Latin sources, in addition to the Vulgate.

Apart from the negative witness of most of the extant Old Latin sources, the support for the AV1611 considerably outweighs its opponents and pre-dates them, as Dr Hills<sup>65</sup> p 142-4 points out.

*“Christ’s Reply To The Rich Young Man (Matt. 19:16-17)*

*“As Tregelles (1854) observed long ago, we have in Matt. 19:16-17 a test passage in which the relative merits of the Traditional Text on the one side and the Western and Alexandrian texts on the other can be evaluated. Here, according to the Traditional Text, Matthew agrees with Mark and Luke in stating that Jesus answered the rich man’s question, What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life, with the counter-question, Why callest thou Me good. But according to Western and Alexandrian texts, Matthew disagrees here with Mark and Luke, affirming that Jesus’ counter-question was, Why askest thou Me concerning the good. It is this latter reading that is found in Aleph B D and eight other Greek manuscripts, in the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions and in Origen, Eusebius, and Augustine.*

*“The earliest extant evidence, however, favors the Traditional reading, why callest thou Me good. It is found in the following 2nd-century Fathers: Justin Martyr (c. 150), He answered to one who addressed Him as Good Master, Why callest thou Me good? Irenaeus (c. 180), And to the person who said to Him Good Master, He confessed that God who is truly good, saying, Why callest thou Me good? Hippolytus (c. 200), Why callest thou Me good? One is good, My Father who is in heaven. Modern critics attempt to evade this ancient evidence for the Traditional reading, Why callest thou Me good, by claiming that these early Fathers took this reading from Mark and Luke and not from Matthew. But this is a very unnatural supposition. It is very improbable that all three of these 2nd-century Fathers were quoting from Mark and Luke rather than from Matthew, for Matthew was the dominant Gospel and therefore much more likely to be quoted from than the other two.*

*“The internal evidence also clearly favors the Traditional reading, Why callest thou Me good. The Western and Alexandrian reading, Why askest thou Me concerning the good, has a curiously unbiblical ring. It does not savor of God but of men. It smacks of the philosophy or pseudo-philosophy which was common among the Hellenized gentiles but was probably little known in the strictly Jewish circles in which these words are represented as having been spoken. In short, the Western and Alexandrian reading, Why askest thou Me concerning the good, reminds us strongly of the interminable discussions of the philosophers concerning the summum bonum (the highest good). How could Jesus have reproved the young man for inviting Him to such a discussion, when it was clear that the youth had in no wise done this but had come to Him concerning an entirely different matter, namely, the obtaining of eternal life?*

*“Modern critics agree that the Western and Alexandrian reading, Why askest thou Me concerning the good, does not fit the context and is not what Jesus really said. What Jesus really said, critics admit, was, Why callest thou Me good, the reading recorded in Mark. Matthew altered this reading, critics believe, to avoid theological difficulties. W. C. Allen (1907), for example, conjectures, “Matthew’s changes are probably intentional to avoid the rejection by Christ of the title ‘good’, and the apparent distinction made between Himself and God.” B. C. Butler (1951), however, has punctured this critical theory with the following well placed objection. “If Matthew had wanted to change the*

*Marcan version, he could have found an easier way of doing so (by simple omission of our Lord's comment on the man's mode of speech). This remark is very true, and to it we may add that if Matthew had found difficulty with this word of Jesus it would hardly have occurred to him to seek to solve the problem by bringing in considerations taken from Greek philosophy."*

It is for these reasons, articulated so well by Dr Hills, that Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 105, 139, 217, 316</sup> calls the modern reading *"that stupid fabrication," "an absurd fabrication" and "the mere fabrication,"* which are precise terms, well-chosen.

Dean Burgon states further that *"misled by a depraved Text, our Revisers have often made nonsense of what before was perfectly clear: and have not only thrust many of our LORD'S precious utterances out of sight, (e.g. Matt. xvii. 21: Mark x. 21 and xi. 26 [three verses that White<sup>3 p 155, 158-162</sup> explicitly disputes. See Chapter 7] Luke ix. 55, 56); but have attributed to Him absurd sayings which He certainly never uttered, (e.g. Matt. xix. 17)."*

Dr Ruckman<sup>121 p 370</sup> has this summary for the modern reading, *"Why askest thou Me concerning the good?"* his emphases.

*"Origen (240), Eusebius (313), Jerome (340), and Augustine (354) favor this philosophical perversion of the text. All are a-millennial or post-millennial "Catholics."*

*"“Why askest thou Me concerning the good” is found in Vaticanus, the Old Latin, some Old Syriac, and Sinaiticus and its appearance here is an ominous warning (unheeded by scholars that the “philosophy,” which Colossians 2 speaks against is in charge of the men who handled the Heyschian (Egyptian type) text, from which all the new Bibles come. A Socratic dialogue yielding up a stale crumb of Greek philosophy (see Hills, “King James Bible Defended”) has nothing in common with what Jesus actually did say to the rich young ruler. The correct reading is undoubtedly the A.V. 1611 Version...and the spurious interpolation of Westcott and Hort found in the ASV, RV, RSV and other Catholic translations is as far from the truth as you could go without offering up your rooster with Socrates (469-399 BC) and committing suicide with him!"*

Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 59, 104-5, 128 p 68-9</sup> has additional sets of comments on Matthew 19:17, his emphases, that merit careful consideration, because they reveal the mindset of the corrupters of the verse, principally Origen.

*"When Origen hit the text, he lost his “neutral approach,” for the text is one of the greatest in the New Testament on the depravity of man and the Deity of Jesus Christ. These are two “doctrinal subjects” which cannot be learned in any University or College. They are subjects of Revelation by the Spirit of God; consequently, in no place in the scripture is the spiritual ignorance of the ASV and RSV committees [and all other modern version committees] revealed any clearer than here. They bit at Origen's bait and in so doing they ignored 10 fundamental facts of history and Christian doctrine.*

1. *No orthodox Jewish “ruler” would waste five minutes discussing the “Summum Bonum” of the Greek philosophers.*
2. *The question in the text was about ETERNAL LIFE, not the “Summum Bonum!”*
3. *Any Jew who read his scriptures knew what the “supreme good” was, and would never have doubted this absolute standard for a moment.*

4. *Not even the questions of the Sadducees and Pharisees were philosophical questions – they were all questions about Religious Authority and fidelity to the Mosaic Law.*
5. *The young man is asking, “What good thing shall I do?” Not, “What is THE GOOD?”*
6. *The answer Jesus gives is a rebuke to the Ruler’s adjective in describing Him (Jesus), “Why callest thou me good?”*
7. *What follows is a statement to the effect that, “If I am not good I am not God, and if I am not God I am not good!” Note: “There is none good but one: that is God.”*
8. *But oh! How this hurts the pride of an Alexandrian Greek scholar who has castrated himself and gone barefoot to earn Heavenly merits!! And oh! How this crucifies the pride of the men working on the ASV and RSV committees [and the others]! “There is none good but one: that is God.”*
9. *No man can remain neutral when dealing with the Word of God. (Matt 12:25, 30, Mark 9:4, Rev 3:15, 16.) And it is only the egotistical conceit of men with linguistic ability that makes them think they have achieved this impossibility. None of them attained it.*
10. *What Westcott and Hort sold to the unregenerate world of Bible denying Liberals (and the regenerate world of dead Orthodox “Christians”), was the corrupt fifth column of an apostate Christian Gnostic, who never believed for a minute that he was handling God’s words.*

*“The text of the ASV (1901) and the “new” ASV is this text [and that of the RV, Nestle, NIV, NKJV marg. or f.n., NWT, JB].”*

White’s next attack is on Mark 1:2 and the term *“the prophets.”* See comments on this verse in *Chapters 3, 5* and the extensive discussion in *Chapter 7*, which includes a response to White’s criticism<sup>3 p 255</sup> of bible believers with respect to Matthew 27:9.

White<sup>3 p 255-7</sup> now tries to cast doubt on Mark 16:9-20 as found in the AV1611. He is, however, forced to admit that, *“It is found in nearly every manuscript of the New Testament ever written... Only the dreaded [not by bible believers, who merely relegate them back to the shelf and the trash pile from whence they came] and hated [no, evaluated, see Dean Burgon’s analysis in Chapter 3] 8 and B (and one other manuscript) do not have the passage, and even then, room is left for it in B...”*

Following this admission, White then puts forward the question, *“Why do nearly all modern translations either set the section apart or even reduce it to footnotes?”* He answers this question as follows.

*“Beginning with the external evidence, we note...the passage is excluded from 8, B, and 304.”* White refers to several of the less important versions that do not contain the passage and adds that, *“Jerome was aware of manuscripts that did not contain the passage.”*

White then states, his emphases, that, *“the passage is included in a number of manuscripts along with critical marks...indicating that the scribe knew of the questionable nature of the passage. These would include f<sup>d</sup> [Family 1], 205, and others. Quite significantly there is an alternative “shorter” ending that is found in the Latin “k”...This same shorter ending is combined with the longer ending in L Ψ 083 099 274<sup>m8</sup> 579 l [lec-*

tionary] 1602...Codex W [adds] an entire paragraph to the longer ending between verses 14 and 15.”

According to White, “Jerome indicated that [this addition] was popular in some [unspecified and unnumbered] places.” White adds 3 of the less important versions to the foregoing list, together with “some Old [tenth century] Church Slavonic manuscripts [that] include only verses 9 through 11 of the longer ending.”

Citing Warfield in support, White maintains that, “the multiplicity of readings...causes so many experts [area(s) of expertise unspecified] to reject the originality of the longer ending...One must explain the existence of the shorter ending **and** the use of [marks] to set verses 9 through 20 off **and** the inclusion of the long paragraph in W **and** the manuscripts that put both the long and short endings together. There simply would be no need for all these different endings if verses 9 through 20 were part of the gospel when it was originally written.”

All of the above can be explained and have been, from sources that White had available to him.

“To set...off” White’s conjectures above, “the external evidence” in favour of Mark 16:9-20 as found in the AV1611 is as follows, using in part this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 66-7</sup>. The weight of favourable evidence easily counters White’s flimsy assemblage of counter-witnesses.

Of the modern Greek editors before Westcott and Hort, only Tischendorf omitted verses 9-20, while Alford regarded them as doubtful<sup>62</sup>. The pre-1611 bibles did neither. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops’<sup>138</sup> all unequivocally contain the verses.

These verses are also found in Westcott and Hort’s RV and Nestle, although Westcott and Hort’s Greek Text and that of Nestle regard the verses as doubtful<sup>60 p 30</sup>.

This author’s summary is as follows, with updated references.

### “Mark 16:9-20

“The NIV has a note between verses 8 and 9 stating that the most reliable early manuscripts do not contain Mark 16:9-20.

“The NKJV has a marginal note [footnote] stating that Aleph and B do not contain the verses, although most other manuscripts of Mark do.

“The NWT has verses 9-20 as a “long conclusion”, indicating that manuscripts A, C, D include it, while Aleph, B, the Syriac and Armenian versions omit them. NWT also has the “short conclusion” in its text [after the long conclusion and concluding Mark 16], “And they delivered all these instructions briefly to Peter and his companions. Afterwards Jesus himself sent out by them from east to west the sacred and imperishable message of eternal salvation.” The JB insists that MANY manuscripts omit the verses.

“The evidence in favour of the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20 is overwhelming. The TBS publication *The Authenticity of The Last Twelve Verses of...Mark* is an excellent summary, drawing mainly from Burgon<sup>13 p 36-40, 422-424</sup> and Burgon’s work cited by Fuller<sup>64 p 25-130</sup>. See also Burton<sup>149 p 62-63</sup>, Fuller<sup>12 p 168-169</sup>, Hills<sup>65 p 161-162, 110 p 133-134</sup>, Ruckman<sup>18 p 132</sup>.

“The TBS publication - see above - states that only 2 Greek manuscripts (Aleph and B) out of a total of 620 which contain the Gospel of Mark, omit the verses. See Burgon, cited by Fuller<sup>64 p 60-61</sup>. Moreover, Burgon, *ibid.* p 67, states that a blank space has been left in B, where the verses should have been but where the scribe obviously omitted them.

“As further evidence in favour of the verses, Burgon<sup>13 p 423, 12 p 169</sup>, cites:

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Century: Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac versions, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Century: Coptic and Sahidic versions, Hippolytus, Vincentius, ‘Acta Pilati’ - by an unknown author, Apostolic Constitutions
- 4<sup>th</sup> Century: Curetonian Syriac and Gothic versions, Syriac Table of Canons, Eusebius, Macarius Magnes, Aphraates, Didymus, The Syriac ‘Acts of the Apostles’, Epiphanius, Leontius, Ephraem, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine
- 5<sup>th</sup> Century: Armenian version (some copies), Codices A and C, Leo, Nestorius, Cyril of Alexandria, Victor of Antioch, Patricius, Marius Mercator
- 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Codex D, Georgian and Ethiopic versions, Hesychius, Gregentius, Prosper, Archbishop John of Thessalonica, Bishop Modestus of Jerusalem.

“The TBS also cites the Philoxenian Syriac of the 5<sup>th</sup> century as containing the verses. Hills and Ruckman also cite Tatian (2<sup>nd</sup> century) as quoting the verses. Hills<sup>65 p 162, 110 p 134</sup>, states that besides Aleph and B, the Sinaitic Syriac - from the same source as Aleph, 2 manuscripts of the Georgian version and 62 of the Armenian version omit the verses. The Old Latin manuscript k has the “short conclusion” instead of verses 9-20. Burgon<sup>64 p 81-82</sup>, explains how this short ending has been obtained solely from Codex L, an 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> century manuscript “with an exceedingly vicious text”, *ibid.* Hills explains the omission of verses 9-20 from the above handful of documents as indicative of the work of heretics, especially docetists who sought to de-emphasise post resurrection appearances of the Lord from the Gospel record, *ibid.* p 138-141, p 166-168.

“Burgon<sup>64 p 49-60</sup> also demonstrated that the supposed adverse testimony of ancient writers is spurious, resting on a quotation from Eusebius, which does NOT deny verses 9-20.”

Dr Moorman’s<sup>9 p 85</sup> summary of the manuscript evidence for Mark 16:9-20 includes 23-24 uncials A, C, D, E, F, G, K, M, S, U, V, X, Y, Γ, Δ, Θ, Π, Σ, Ω, 047, 055, 0211, 0257 and possibly 0233. Uncials H, L, W, Ψ, 099, 0112 contain the verses, with variation – that bible critics like White have of course been eager to seize upon. The majority of cursives contain the verses, along with the 18 or so manuscripts of Families 1, 13. White refers to the manuscripts of Family 1 as containing “critical marks,” – see above - the significance of which he has misunderstood – see below – but Dr Moorman’s citation indicates that Family 1 contains Mark 16:9-20 without variation. It should be remembered that these families represent a 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century text<sup>9 p 27</sup>, i.e. contemporaneous with main witnesses against Mark 16:9-20, i.e. Ⳁ and B.

But Dr Moorman lists witnesses in favour of Mark 16:9-20 whose texts pre-date Ⳁ and B. They include the Peshitta Syriac and 11 copies of the Old Latin, the texts of which date from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and the 4<sup>th</sup> century Gothic Bible, i.e. almost contemporaneous with Ⳁ and B.

Dr Moorman has this comment on the passage that White should have considered.

“Early bishops who claimed to be direct successors of the apostles would find their inability to perform the works of the apostles (II Cor 12:12) a matter of embarrassment. Are we really to believe that the Gospel of Mark would end in verse 8 with the words “for they were afraid”? See Burgon’s great work on this chapter [summarised below].”

Dr Moorman<sup>130 p 44</sup> lists the following church fathers as citing the passage; Tatian, Irenaeus, each 2<sup>nd</sup> century, Tertullian, Cyprian, each 3<sup>rd</sup> century, Aphrahat, Apostolic Constitutions, Ambrose, each 4<sup>th</sup> century. He also cites Jerome's Vulgate as containing the verses, which is important with respect to White's references to Jerome and which will be addressed again below. Note that White does not mention that Jerome included mark 16:9-20 in his Vulgate.

Significantly, Dr Moorman makes a further observation that White overlooked.

*"There is no indication in the indexes of ANPF [Ante and Post Nicene Fathers] of a pre-400 AD Father quoting up to verse 8, and then stopping."*

Dr Moorman lists the main witnesses against Mark 16:9-20 as  $\aleph$  and B, one cursive, i.e. 304 as cited by White and the Old Latin source, k that White also cites. See Dr Hills<sup>65 p 158ff</sup> and Dr Holland<sup>55 p 148-150</sup> for additional summaries with respect to manuscript evidence for and against Mark 16:9-20.

Dr Holland has a note that puts in correct perspective White's misleading assertion that *"There simply would be no need for all these different endings if verses 9 through 20 were part of the gospel when it was originally written."* Dr Holland's manuscript citations essentially match those of Dr Moorman (and White), though with some variation.

*"The manuscripts reveal four endings to Mark's Gospel. 1. The longer ending, which is the reading of almost all existing Greek manuscripts, and is in line with the Traditional Text. 2. The shorter ending, sometimes referred to as the intermediate ending. This ending is found in L,  $\Psi$ , 099, 0112, 274 and 579 [lectionary copy, according to White, see above]. 3. The expanded ending, which is found in Codex W. This ending is widely rejected. No ending after verse 8. This is the view held by most textual scholars [most likely White's "many experts"] and agrees with Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus."*

White is using a little over 1 in a 100 witnesses to force the exception to overthrow the rule, a blatant exercise in compelling the tail to wag the dog.

Dr Hills<sup>65 p 166-8</sup> decisively disposes of White's speculations about Old Latin source k and Codex W as follows. Dr Hills refers to apocryphal sources that White fails to specify.

#### ***"Were Heretics Responsible for the Omission of Mark 16:9-20?"***

*"Burgon died in 1888, too soon to give us the benefit of his comment on a development which had taken place shortly before his death, namely, the discovery in 1884 of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter in a tomb at Akhmim in Egypt. Had Burgon lived longer, he would not have failed to point out the true significance of the agreement of this Gospel of Peter with the Old Latin New Testament manuscript k in the last chapter of the Gospel of Mark."*

*"According to modern scholars, the original Gospel of Peter was written about 150 A.D. by docetic heretics who denied the reality of Christ's sufferings and consequently the reality of His human body. This false view is seen in the account which this apocryphal writing gives of Christ's crucifixion. In it we are told that when our Lord hung upon the cross, the divine Christ departed to heaven and left only the human Jesus to suffer and die."*

*"And the Lord cried out aloud saying: My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me. And when he had so said, he was taken up."*

*"Also the account which the Gospel of Peter gives of the resurrection of Christ is uniquely docetic."*

“...and they saw the heavens opened and two men descend thence having a great light, and drawing near unto the sepulchre... and the sepulchre was opened, and both of the young men entered in . . . and while they were yet telling them the things which they had seen, they saw again three men come out of the sepulchre, and two of them sustaining the other, and a cross following after them. And of the two they saw that their heads reached unto heaven, but of him that was led by them that it overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice out of the heavens saying, Hast thou preached unto them that sleep? And an answer was heard from the cross, saying: Yea.”

“In the Gospel of Mark the Old Latin New Testament manuscript *k* gives a heretical, docetic account of the resurrection of Christ similar to that found in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter. In Mark 16:4 manuscript *k* reads as follows:

“Suddenly, moreover, at the third hour of the day, darkness fell upon the whole world, and angels descended from heaven, and as the Son of God was rising in brightness, they ascended at the same time with him, and straightway it was light.”

“It is generally believed by scholars that *k* represents an early form of the Old Latin version, which, like the Gospel of Peter, dates from the 2nd century. If this is so, the fact that *k* agrees with the Gospel of Peter in giving a docetic account of the resurrection of Christ indicates that Irenaeus (c. 180) was correct in pointing out a special connection between the Gospel of Mark and docetism. This ancient Father observed that docetic heretics “who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained incapable of suffering, but that it was Jesus who suffered,” preferred the Gospel of Mark.

“In chapter 16 of Mark, then, the Old Latin *k* contains a text which has been tampered with by docetic heretics who, like the author of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, denied the reality of Christ’s sufferings and of His human body. And this same *k* also omits the last twelve verses of Mark and substitutes in their place the so-called “short ending,” which omits the post-resurrection appearances of Christ.

“And all things whatsoever that had been commanded they explained briefly to those who were with Peter; after these things also Jesus Himself appeared and from the east unto the west sent out through them the holy and uncorrupted preaching of eternal salvation. Amen.”

“Do not these facts fit together perfectly and explain each other? The same docetic heretics who tampered with the first half of Mark 16 in *k* also abbreviated the second half of Mark 16 in this same manuscript. They evidently thought that in the last twelve verses of Mark too great emphasis was placed on the bodily appearances of Christ to His disciples. They therefore rejected these concluding verses of Mark’s Gospel and substituted a “short ending” of their own devising, a docetic conclusion in which Christ’s post-resurrection appearances are almost entirely eliminated.

“In addition to these docetists who abbreviated the conclusion of Mark’s Gospel there were also other heretics, probably Gnostics, who expanded it by adding after Mark 16:14 a reading which was known to Jerome (415) and which appears as follows in Codex W

“And they answered and said, ‘This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who doth not allow the truth of God to prevail over the unclean things of the spirits. Therefore reveal thy righteousness now.’ So spake they to Christ. And Christ answered them, ‘The term of the years of Satan’s dominion hath been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near. And for those who have sinned I was delivered over unto death, that they may return to the truth and sin no more, that they may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven.’”



*“Hence, in addition to the causes which Dean Burgon discussed so ably, the tampering of heretics must have been one of the factors which brought about the omission of Mark 16:9-20 in the few New Testament documents which do omit this passage.*

*“We see, then, that believing scholars who receive the last twelve verses of Mark as genuine are more reasonable than naturalistic scholars who reject them [like James White]. For there are many reasons why these verses might have been omitted by the few New Testament documents which do omit them, but no reason has yet been invented which can explain satisfactorily either how a hypothetical “lost ending” of Mark could have disappeared from all the extant New Testament documents or how the author of Mark’s Gospel could have left it incomplete without any ending at all.”*

Dr Ruckman<sup>18 p 130-3, 33 p 60-2</sup> has an informative summary of the manuscript evidence for and against Mark 16:9-20 and states that, his emphases, *“As Dr Hills has pointed out, the only thing that the critics agree on is that Mark 16:9-20 is not in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. **How** it was omitted, **why** it was omitted, what **should have been there**, and why **what now stands there** (in the AV) is wrong, is something they don’t seem to be able to talk about...”*

White gives his opinion about why verses 12, 14, 16-18 are supposedly *“out of place and inconsistent,” “out of character with...Jesus’ teaching”* and *“reminiscent of apocryphal writings”* but he cannot point to any consensus among bible critics in this respect. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Some say that Mark ended his gospel intentionally at verse 8. But when does the New Testament “Good News” end on a negative note? It doesn’t in Matthew, Luke, or John. It doesn’t in Acts, Romans, Corinthians, or Ephesians. It doesn’t in Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, or 2 Timothy. It doesn’t in 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, or Revelation. Why would anyone think that the first writer (most of the naturalistic critics say that Mark wrote first) ended with “**for they were afraid**”? (Verse 8.) Isn’t this rather stupid?*

*“Others say that Mark intended to finish his work but died, at verse 8, and couldn’t finish it. But Papias (150 AD), Clement of Alexandria (200 AD), and “good old Eusebius” and Origen say that Mark lived to publish it! (It’s too late for W & H to dump Origen and Eusebius now!)*

*“The third theory is that Mark 16:9-20 vanished into thin air. It was lost. It was torn out. It was burned. It was snipped out with a pair of scissors, etc. But as Creed (1930) pointed out, how in the world did the “snip snapper” manage to tear the last 12 verses off 200 copies of Mark’s gospel which were circulating all over Asia Minor, Italy, and Palestine? Not even Origen with his 14 stenographers and copyists could have done that – although he probably tried!*

*“But the evidence that the A.V.1611 is the authentic reading is tremendous...”*

*“The correct reading is found in every Greek manuscript in the world (that contains Mark) except Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. This ratio is better than 100 to 1...”*

*“In addition to this evidence are all the Syriac versions with the exception of the Sinaitic Syriac, all the old Latin manuscripts except “k” (a close kin to Origen), and the verses are quoted by Hippolytus (200), Irenaeus (180), Tatian (175), and Justin Martyr (150). (The “k” manuscript has a spurious ending which would fool no one – not even W & H [though White regards it as “significant” in his efforts to cast doubt on Mark 16:9-20]...This Latin innovation is the work of a papist trying to put Matthew 24:27 into the*

*past*, [spiritualising “**the lightning**” as “*the holy and uncorrupted preaching of eternal salvation*”] and promote the primacy of Peter over Paul.)

“The A.V. reading is the correct one, as usual.”

Dean Burgon<sup>64</sup> p 52ff, 76ff, Chapters III, IV, VIII Unabridged Web Source neatly disposes of White’s appeal to the testimony of Jerome and his opinion of the “**critical marks**.”

“We have next to consider what Jerome has delivered on this subject. So great a name must needs command attention in any question of Textual Criticism: and it is commonly pretended that Jerome pronounces emphatically against the genuineness of the last twelve verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark. A little attention to the actual testimony borne by this Father will, it is thought, suffice to exhibit it in a wholly unexpected light; and induce us to form an entirely different estimate of its practical bearing upon the present discussion...”

Burgon quotes Jerome as writing, ““Either we shall reject the testimony of Mark, which is met with in scarcely any copies of the Gospel, — almost all the Greek codices being without this passage:— (especially since it seems to narrate what contradicts the other Gospels:) — or else, we shall reply that both Evangelists [Matthew and Mark] state what is true.””

Burgon shows that Tregelles and others used this statement to prove that Jerome denied the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20. However, Burgon shows further that the statement is not Jerome’s but his translation of a writing of Eusebius’s, where Eusebius put forward the above statement as an example of how the bible critics of *his* day attempted to discredit Mark 16:9-20 as scripture.

Burgon quotes Eusebius in this context as writing, his emphasis, “Eusebius in a manner repudiates them [statements like the above, translated by Jerome]; for he introduces them with a phrase which separates them from himself: and, “This then is what a person will say, He who is for getting rid of the entire passage will say that it is not met with in **all** the copies of Mark’s Gospel” — is the remark with which he finally dismisses them.”

Following extensive comments on Jerome’s use of Eusebius’s writing on Mark 16:9-20, Burgon concludes, his emphases, that because Jerome “*translates, — not adopts, but translates, — the problem as well as its solution*” therefore, “We must hear no more about Jerome, therefore, as a witness against the genuineness of the concluding verses of S. Mark’s Gospel.”

See also Dr Hills’s<sup>65</sup> p 164-6 analysis of Jerome’s and Eusebius’s statements on Mark 16:9-20. It is a pity that White took no notice of their research. Burgon adds, with respect to Jerome.

“Proof is at hand that Jerome held these verses to be genuine. The proper evidence of this is supplied by the fact that he gave them a place in his revision of the old Latin version of the Scriptures. If he had been indeed persuaded of their absence from “almost all the Greek codices,” does any one imagine that he would have suffered them to stand in the Vulgate? If he had met with them in “scarcely any copies of the Gospel,” — do men really suppose that he would yet have retained them?”

See Moorman’s evidence above that includes the Vulgate as a witness in favour of Mark 16:9-20. Burgon continues, stating first in Chapter III in the online version of his work.

“The fact remains, however, that Jerome, besides giving these last twelve verses a place in the Vulgate, quotes S. Mark xvi. 14, as well as ver. 9, in the course of his writings.”

He then concludes<sup>64 p 54</sup>, therefore, “*It is an additional proof that Jerome accepted the conclusion of S. Mark’s Gospel that he actually quotes it, and on more than one occasion: but to prove this, is to prove more than is here required. See above, [Chapter III]. I am concerned only to demolish the assertion of Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and Alford, and Davidson, and so many more [including James White], concerning the testimony of Jerome; and I have demolished it. I pass on, claiming to have shewn that the name of Jerome as an adverse witness must never again appear in this discussion.*”

Burgon examines in considerable detail the so-called “**critical marks**” by which White sets great store in subverting Mark 16:9-20. Burgon states, his emphasis.

“*We are assured, — (by Dr. Tregelles for example,) — that “a Note or a Scholion stating the absence of these verses from many, from most, or from the most correct copies (often from Victor or Severus) is found in twenty-five other cursive Codices.” Tischendorf has nearly the same words: “Scholia” (he says) “in very many MSS. state that the Gospel of Mark in the most ancient (and most accurate) copies ended at the ninth verse.” That distinguished Critic supports his assertion by appealing to seven MSS. in particular, — and referring generally to “about twenty-five others”...*

“*I simply **deny the fact.** I entirely deny that the “Note or Scholion” which these learned persons affirm to be of such frequent occurrence has any existence whatever, — except in their own imaginations. On the other hand, I assert that notes or scholia which state the exact reverse, (viz. that “in the older” or “the more accurate copies” the last twelve verses of S. Mark’s Gospel **are contained,**) recur even perpetually. The plain truth is this:— These eminent persons have taken their information at second-hand, — partly from Griesbach, partly from Scholz,—without suspicion and without inquiry...*”

After carrying out his detailed examination of the work of Griesbach and Scholz, Burgon concludes as follows, his emphases, about these marks that he refers to (with diagrams) as ““Notes”” and ““Scholia.””

“*So far, therefore, as “Notes” and “Scholia” in MSS. are concerned, the sum of the matter proves to be simply this:—*

“*(a) Nine Codices are observed to contain a note to the effect that the end of S. Mark’s Gospel, though wanting “in some,” was yet found “in others,” — “in many,” — “in the ancient copies.”*

“*(b) Next, four Codices subscriptions vouching for the genuineness of this portion of the Gospel by declaring that those four Codices had been **collated with approved copies preserved at Jerusalem.***

“*(c) Lastly, sixteen Codices, (to which...I am able to add at least five others, making twenty-two in all,) — contain a weighty critical scholion asserting categorically that in “very many” and “accurate copies,” specially in the “true Palestinian exemplar,” **these verses had been found by one who seems to have verified the fact of their existence there for himself.***

“*And now, shall I be thought unfair if, on a review of the premises, I assert that I do not see a shadow of reason for the imposing statement which has been adopted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and the rest [including James White], that “there exist about thirty Codices which state that from the more ancient and more accurate copies of the Gospel, the last twelve verses of S. Mark were absent?” I repeat, there is not so much as **one single Codex** which contains such a scholion; while twenty-four of those commonly enumerated state **the exact reverse.** — We may now advance a step: but the candid reader is invited*

to admit that hitherto the supposed hostile evidence is on the contrary entirely in favour of the verses under discussion. (“I called thee to curse mine enemies, and, behold, thou hast altogether blessed them these three times.”) [Numbers 24:10]”

White uses Codex L to cast doubt on Mark 16:9-20, because this source and a few others, including the margin of the Harclean Syriac<sup>9 p 35</sup> contain the “shorter ending...combined with the longer ending.”

Burgon refutes the “shorter ending” as follows.

“Nothing has been hitherto said about Cod. L. This is the designation of an uncial MS. of the viii<sup>th</sup> or ix<sup>th</sup> century, in the Library at Paris, chiefly remarkable for the correspondence of its readings with those of Cod. B and with certain of the citations in Origen; a peculiarity which recommends Cod. L, (as it recommends three cursive Codices of the Gospels, 1, 33, 69,) to the especial favour of a school with which whatever is found in Cod. B is necessarily right. It is described as the work of an ignorant foreign copyist, who probably wrote with several MSS. before him; but who is found to have been wholly incompetent to determine which reading to adopt and which to reject. Certain it is that he interrupts himself, at the end of ver. 8, to write as follows:—

““SOMETHING TO THIS EFFECT IS ALSO MET WITH:

“““All that was commanded them they immediately rehearsed unto Peter and the rest. And after these things, from East even unto West, did Jesus Himself send forth by their means the holy and incorruptible message of eternal Salvation.”

““BUT THIS ALSO IS MET WITH AFTER THE WORDS, ‘FOR THEY WERE AFRAID:’

“““Now, when He was risen early, the first day of the week”, etc...

“It was evidently the production of some one who desired to remedy the conspicuous incompleteness of his own copy of S. Mark’s Gospel, but who had imbibed so little of the spirit of the Evangelical narrative that he could not in the least imitate the Evangelist’s manner. As for the scribe who executed Codex L, he was evidently incapable of distinguishing the grossest fabrication from the genuine text. The same worthless supplement is found in the margin of the Harklensian Syriac (A.D. 616), and in a few other quarters of less importance [like James White’s book]. I pass on, with the single remark that I am utterly at a loss to understand on what principle Cod. L, — a solitary MS. of the viii<sup>th</sup> or ix<sup>th</sup> century which exhibits an exceedingly vicious text, — is to be thought entitled to so much respectful attention on the present occasion, rebuked as it is for the fallacious evidence it bears concerning the last twelve verses of the second Gospel by all the seventeen remaining Uncials, (three of which are from 300 to 400 years more ancient than itself;) and by **every cursive copy of the Gospels in existence**. Quite certain at least is it that not the faintest additional probability is established by Cod. L that S. Mark’s Gospel when it left the hands of its inspired Author was in a mutilated condition. The copyist shews that he was as well acquainted as his neighbours with our actual concluding Verses: while he betrays his own incapacity, by seeming to view with equal favour the worthless alternative which he deliberately transcribes as well, and to which he gives the foremost place. **Not S. Mark’s Gospel, but Codex L is the sufferer by this appeal.**”

White also refers to “tenth century...Old Church Slavonic manuscripts” as valid witnesses against Mark 16:9-20. Burgon refutes this notion of White’s as well.

“I go back now to the statements found in certain Codices of the x<sup>th</sup> century, (derived probably from one of older date,) to the effect that “the marginal references to the Eusebian Canons extend no further than ver. 8:”

Burgon is of the view that the Canons “*may have extended, and probably did extend, down to the end of ver. 11.*” This may explain White’s statement that the “*Old Church Slavonic manuscripts...include...verses 9 through 11 of the longer ending.*” Burgon continues.

*“Now this statement need not have delayed us for many minutes. But then, therewith, recent Critics have seen fit to connect another and an entirely distinct proposition: viz. that of Ammonius, also, a contemporary of Origen, conspires with Eusebius in disallowing the genuineness of the conclusion of B. Mark’s Gospel. This is in fact a piece of evidence to which recently special prominence has been given: every Editor of the Gospels in turn, since Wetstein, having reproduced it; but no one more emphatically than Tischendorf. “Neither by the sections of Ammonius nor yet by the canons of Eusebius are these last verses recognised.”*”

Burgon shows by means of exhaustive examination that “*the sections of Ammonius*” no longer exist and that their precise content cannot be ascertained and that therefore, his emphasis, “*concerning the supposed testimony of Ammonius. It is nil.*”

Of Eusebius’s work, Burgon explains that Eusebius constructed a harmony of the Gospels by first dividing the four Gospels into numbered sub-sections. He then devised a series of canons, or tables, numbered I to X, “*whose office it was to indicate in which of his X Canons, or Tables, the reader would find the corresponding places [numbered sub-section] in any of the other Gospels. If the section was unique, it belonged to his last or X<sup>th</sup> Canon.*”

Thus Eusebius was concerned with identifying parallel accounts in the Gospels, not with validating the textual authenticity of any particular passage such as Mark 16:9-20.

Burgon, after further detailed examination, therefore concludes, his emphases, “*Let it be assumed, for argument sake, that the statement “Eusebius canonized no farther than ver. 8” is equivalent to this, — “Eusebius numbered no Sections after ver. 8:” (and more it cannot mean:) — What then? As a matter of fact, Codices abound in which the Sections are noted without the Canons, throughout. We heard the same Eusebius remark that one way of shelving a certain awkward problem would be, to plead that the subsequent portion of S. Mark’s Gospel is frequently wanting [see Burgon’s remarks on Jerome above]. What more have we learned when we have ascertained that the same Eusebius allowed no place to that subsequent portion in his Canons? The new fact, (supposing it to be a fact,) is but the correlative of the old one; and since it was Eusebius who was the voucher for that, what additional probability do we establish that the inspired autograph of S. Mark ended abruptly at ver. 8, by discovering that Eusebius is consistent with himself, and omits to “canonize” (or even to “sectionize”) what he had already hypothetically hinted might as well be left out altogether? (See above...)*”

In other words, the value of “*Old Church Slavonic manuscripts*” as evidence that Mark 16:9-20 is not authentic is like the validity of the remainder of White’s “*external evidence*” and “*the supposed testimony of Ammonius*” – i.e. “*nil.*”

Having assembled the paltry external evidence against Mark 16:9-20, White continues in his tail-wagging-dog exercise by moving to “*internal evidence.*” Although he mentions the arguments against the passage based on its inclusion of supposedly “*non-Markan*” expressions, he does not enlarge upon it because “*This area of debate seems unable to provide any clear direction on the matter.*” Dean Burgon<sup>64 p 82ff, Chapter 9</sup> and Dr Hills<sup>65 p 83</sup> in fact provide very “*clear direction on the matter,*” which is probably why White

avoided these authors, although their work was readily available to him, Dr Hills's book being cited in White's bibliography.

He brazenly declares, his emphasis, that *"The content of the passage has often been criticized, and rightly so [not by any early Christian writers – see Moorman's statement above]...the natural [i.e. unspiritual, contrast John 16:13] reading of these verses strongly suggests that the person who wrote them was **not** completely familiar with the entire Gospel of Mark itself and was utilizing apocryphal and unorthodox sources.*

*"The first anomaly is found in verse 12. Jesus is said to appear in a "different form" ...to two disciples, most probably the two on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35)...supernaturally kept from recognizing the Lord until He had broken bread with them (Luke 24:16, 31). However, it seems unusual that this phrase would be used, as it tends to make one think that Jesus could change His form at will...[which] seems out of place and inconsistent..."*

White forgot John 21:4, which is neither "out of place" nor "inconsistent" with respect to Mark 16:12. ***"But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore: but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus."***

White also missed Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>39 p 32-3</sup> insights into ***"the similitude of the Lord"*** Numbers 12:8.

*"The "form" of the Word, Jesus Christ, seemed different at various times and places, yet it was still Jesus – He was in the beginning as the Word; he was seen as the Son of God in the fiery furnace...; he was a babe in Mary's womb; he was observed as a twelve year old teaching in the temple; he was transfigured before Peter, James and John and his "face did shine as the sun"; he was watched on the cross at Calvary, when his visage was marred more than any man; he was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; he rose and appeared in his "not yet ascended" form to Mary Magdalene, who thought he was the gardener; he then appeared to two disciples "in another form"; he appeared to John when "His head and his hairs were white, like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire"; today Jesus is seated on the right hand of the Father...When the Word "appeared in another form," as Jesus did, "neither believed they them" (Mark 16:12, 13)..."*

It seems that neither did James White. But he continues.

*"In verse 14, where we have eleven disciples reclining at the table [aside] from the possible numerical problem (was not Thomas absent?), we are here told that "Jesus reproached them for their unbelief and hardness of heart." This is quite out of character, given the other accounts of Jesus' dealings with the disciples after the resurrection...at least one scribe [out of more than 600]...introduced the ninety-word interpolation preserved today by codex W."*

Dr Hills has explained why *"the ninety-word interpolation preserved today by codex W"* is spurious, which explanation White in a most unscholarly fashion refused to address. See above. *"The possible numerical problem"* is solved (for a bible believer) by John 20:24, 26, which describe the Lord's second appearance to His disciples.

***"But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came."***

***"And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you."***

Mark 16:14 is a summary account and the designation “*the eleven*” refers to the disciples collectively, as does the term “*the twelve*” in John 20:24, even though Judas was no longer with the disciples, having gone “*to his own place*” Acts 1:25b. Mark’s use of the expression “*the eleven*” is therefore entirely correct.

By inspection, Mark’s summary refers both to Jesus upbraiding the 10 disciples at His first appearance to them, described in John 20:19-21 and His rebuke to Thomas at the second appearance to them, John 20:26-29. Thomas had rejected the testimony of the other witnesses mentioned in Mark 16:9-13 and of the other disciples who, having seen the Lord at His first appearance to them and then encountering Thomas, “*therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord*” John 20:25.

Mark 16:14 clearly summarizes all these events.

As for “*Jesus’ dealings with the disciples*” in Mark 16:14, note John 20:27, 29.

***“Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing...Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.”***

Note also Luke 24:25, aimed if not at “*the eleven*” verse 33, then certainly at two of the Lord’s more steadfast followers, who had not departed with “*many of his disciples*” in John 6:66.

***“Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.”*** Luke 24:25 is a precise matchmate for Mark 16:14, so White is wrong in his criticism of the verse as “*out of character*” with respect to “*Jesus’ dealings with the disciples after the resurrection*.” (It is somewhat sinister that, like that of Mark 16:9-20, the resurrection account in Luke 24 suffered attack from heretics, resulting in the deletions that occur in Codex D and a few Old Latin manuscripts<sup>65 p 122-5</sup>.)

White continues.

*“In verse 16 [the] conjunction of baptism and belief is unusual to say the least. In no other passage does Jesus tie these things together so intricately. Now it is true that Jesus then goes on to say that the basis for condemnation is unbelief, not lack of baptism...but it still presents a phrase that is out of character with what we know of Jesus’ teaching from Mark’s gospel as well as the other [Gospel?] accounts...”*

Again, White’s insistence that the Lord is speaking “*out of character*” is wrong.

Mark 1:4 states, “***John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins***.”

Mark 1:14, 15 state, “***Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel***.”

The Lord’s exhortation “*repent ye*” relates directly to John’s “*baptism of repentance*,” which the Lord then followed with an exhortation to “*believe the gospel*,” in the form at that time of “*the gospel of the kingdom of God*.”

The principle of baptism accompanying belief with respect to the Gospel, in whatever form it assumed, continued during the Lord’s earthly ministry, according to one of “*the other [Gospel?] accounts*.”

***“After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judaea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized”*** John 3:22.

***“And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him”*** John 3:26.

***“When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,)”*** John 4:1, 2.

Those baptized in these passages must have exercised belief in the Gospel, again in whatever form it took. Observe that the words “*believeth*” and “*believed*” occur 5 times in John 3:15-18 and note especially John 3:36.

***“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.”***

(White doesn’t specify which “*other accounts*” he has in mind so particular examples have been limited to these from John’s Gospel.)

The Lord is simply reiterating the same principle espoused by the verse above in Mark 16:16. This principle is fulfilled in Acts 2:38, although the baptism is not John’s to Israel but Peter’s to Israel. See Dr Ruckman’s<sup>88 p 53ff, 205</sup> works for a comprehensive explanation.

***“Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.”***

Observe that the principle of belief accompanying baptism as the Lord stipulated in Mark 16:16 is still in operation at the time of Peter’s exhortation.

***“And all that believed were together, and had all things common”*** Acts 2:44.

As indicated, White has accused the Lord falsely, Matthew 5:11, with respect to Mark 16:16.

This verse is, of course, part of the Great Commission that the Lord set forth in Mark 16:15 and although the Gospel is now “*the gospel of the grace of God*” Acts 20:24 and the essence of believer’s baptism is no longer one “*of repentance*” but a *picture*, or “*figure*” 1 Peter 3:21 of having been “*baptized into Jesus Christ*” Romans 6:3, the *principle* that the Lord stated in Mark 16:16 still applies, as shown by the account of the Ethiopian eunuch – another passage that is attacked, like Mark 16:9-20.

***“And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God”***

White’s last accusation against the words of the Lord follow.

*“The signs given here [verses 17 and 18] are said to accompany those who have believed, seemingly a promise to all who have believed. This again has no real counterpart in any other passage. Certainly Paul was bitten by a serpent and yet felt no ill effect. But even this story does not remove Christians from the natural consequences of life...Possibly Paul’s experience shows God’s sovereignty over creation and His control of even animal life more than it shows Paul’s ability to be poisoned and yet survive [the two cannot be arbitrarily separated]. These verses are reminiscent...of apocryphal writ-*



ings [none specified] *that were circulating shortly after the close of the New Testament period* [meaning, without a trace of supporting evidence, that Jewish bible believers who had rejected the Old Testament Apocrypha willfully contaminated the New with the words of **“many, which corrupt the word of God”** 2 Corinthians 2:17a].”

The Lord’s words in Mark 16:17, 18 are not “*seemingly a promise to all who have believed.*”

They are a promise to Jewish believers, i.e. the apostles, for the specific purpose set forth in Mark 16:20. (White appears not to have read the passage this far down.)

**“And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.”**

1 Corinthians 1:22 explains why these signs were necessary for the confirmation of the Lord’s words. See also Dr Ruckman’s<sup>206</sup> study on this subject.

**“For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom.”**

The Lord’s words are now confirmed and the confirming signs are now dispensed with, as Paul makes clear in 2 Timothy 3:17 with respect to that for which **“all scripture”** i.e. the AV1611, is now **“profitable”** verse 16, without the need for any **“signs following.”**

**“That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”**

If some “*apocryphal writings*” bore a resemblance to Mark 16:17, 18, then the authors of those writings were guilty of plagiarism. White fails to prove otherwise.

In conclusion on this passage, White attributes Mark 16:9-20 to ““*parallel corruption*”...*drawing from oral stories and the other gospels to create [i.e. forge] the longer ending.*” White thinks that, “*given the external evidence...every translation should provide the passage. However...every translation should note the fact that there is good reason [none furnished by James White] to doubt the authenticity of the passage as well. Allow the readers of Scripture [is this a reference to Mark 16:9-20 or what?] to...come to their own conclusions [about what?].*”

In other words, **“Yea, hath God said?”** Genesis 3:1 and **“In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes”** Judges 21:15.

White’s<sup>3</sup> p 260 next attempt to cast doubt on the word of God is with respect to the phrase **“which is in heaven”** in John 3:13. He states “*Critics of the “modern” texts are quick to pounce upon John 3:13, alleging that here we find the heretical denial of the omnipresence of Christ through the “deletion” of the phrase, “which (who) is in heaven.”*”

White then accuses “*KJV Only advocates*” of wrongly laying “*charges of “heresy” on the part of either the scribes who “corrupted” the text, or the modern translators who would follow their lead*” and he insists that, “*As normal...a calm examination of the facts demonstrates otherwise.*”

White specifically accuses Jay P. Green, author of *The Gnostics, the New Versions, and the Deity of Christ* of providing “*no direct evidence...that the Gnostics tampered with the texts*” of John 3:13 and other important scriptures.

“*As normal,*” a serious examination of White’s “*calm examination*” shows that it is threadbare.

White is forced to allow that, “*the external attestation for the reading is impressive*” and using the *United Bible Societies 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Greek Text*, he lists 9 uncials manuscripts that contain the phrase, 16 cursives, Families 1, 13, with a total of 18 manuscripts, 10 Old

Latin sources and the Vulgate. As omitting the clause, White lists as the main sources P66, P75, א, B, L, T, W, 083, 086 and cursives 33, 1010, 1241.

He states that, *“The patristic material favors the inclusion of the phrase, though there are important witnesses against it.”* The reader is left to speculate why White fails to mention any of these *“important witnesses.”* White then makes the absurd statement that *“it is always uncomfortable to go against P66 and P75 when they are united in a particular reading...it is surely no sign of heresy or a desire to denigrate Christ to follow the lead of the two oldest witnesses to the Gospel of John in not including the reading.”*

P66 and P75 are not *“the two oldest witnesses”* to John 3:13. They are 3<sup>rd</sup> century manuscripts<sup>8 p 5, 9 p 17</sup> and Tatian, 170 AD and Hippolytus, 170-235 AD each quotes *“which is in heaven”* in John 3:13<sup>130 p 47-8</sup>. These witnesses are therefore either earlier than or contemporaneous with P66, P75. They give the lie to the notion of most of Metzger’s Committee members who *“regarded the words [“which is in heaven”] as an interpretive gloss, reflecting later Christological development.”* See below.

Moreover, Pickering<sup>8 p 129, 133-4</sup> has shown that P66, P75 are *“very poor”* manuscript copies. They were not discovered until the 20<sup>th</sup> century and in the words of Dr Mrs Riplinger, dug up *“from the city garbage heaps”* and in the 50 or so years since their discovery, have not triggered any revivals. What authority to P66, P75 have to overthrow that of the Book that has brought in every revival since 1611?

The main relevance of the papyri is that they bear witness to many traditional readings, as found in the AV1611, refuting the critics’ claim<sup>8 p 113ff</sup> that these are ‘late’ or ‘conflated.’

White again appeals to the opinion of Bruce Metzger, who states that *“a minority of the Committee preferred the reading [“which is in heaven”], arguing that (1) if the shorter reading [“which is in heaven” deleted], supported almost exclusively by Egyptian witnesses, were original, there is no discernible motive which would have prompted copyists to add the words [“which is in heaven”], resulting in a most difficult saying...and (2) the diversity of readings implies that the expression [“the Son of man which is in heaven”], having been found objectionable or superfluous in the context, was modified either by omitting the principal clause, or by altering it so as to avoid suggesting that the Son of man was at that moment in heaven...”*

*“The majority of the Committee, impressed by the quality of the external attestation supporting the shorter reading, regarded the words [“which is in heaven”] as an interpretive gloss, reflecting later Christological development.”*

Because Dr Metzger is so ‘open’ about the Committee’s willingness to decide, *“what saith the scripture”* Romans 4:3a by majority vote, White asks the rhetorical question, intended to generate a negative answer, *“who can possibly think that there is...some “conspiracy” afoot to “hide” this passage from the average Christian reader of the Bible [still unspecified, after 261 pages]?”*

How about a ‘conspiracy’ intended to persuade *“the average Christian reader of the [unspecified] Bible”* to trust in bible critics rather than in *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21? White’s book is well suited to that kind of ‘conspiracy.’

1 Thessalonians is often the first Book that a Christian is encouraged to read after getting saved. One good reason for this is found in 1 Thessalonians 2:13, where Paul inserts a necessary warning about individuals like Metzger and White.

**“For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.”**

Metzger and White would mix the scriptures with the opinions of ‘scholarly’ bible critics, so that the result is **“the word of men,”** which is a fitting description of any of the new versions and explains why none of them **“effectually worketh”** in the believer.

The Earl of Shaftesbury’s<sup>8 p 45-6</sup> comments bear repeating.

*“When you are confused or perplexed by a variety of versions, you would be obliged to go to some learned pundit [e.g. James White, Doug Kutilek, ‘our critic,’ Bruce Metzger etc.] in whom you reposed confidence, and ask him which version he recommended; and when you had taken his version, you must be bound by his opinion. I hold this to be the greatest danger that now threatens us. It is a danger pressed upon us from Germany, and pressed upon us by the neological spirit of the age. I hold it to be far more dangerous than Tractarianism, or Popery, both of which I abhor from the bottom of my heart. This evil is tenfold more dangerous, tenfold more subtle than either of these, because you would be ten times more incapable of dealing with the gigantic mischief that would stand before you.”*

No greater **“mischief”** can befall the child of God than the deception that he has that which is supposed to **“effectually worketh”** in him, when in fact it does not.

Some comments have been made about John 3:13 earlier in this work. See **Chapter 3, Chapter 5**, where Dr Hills<sup>8 p 109-110</sup> describes the omission of **“which is in heaven”** from John 3:13, with particular reference to Codex  $\aleph$  as **“beyond all doubt heretical,” Chapter 8**, adding<sup>65 p 136</sup> **“This mutilation of the sacred text ought also, no doubt, to be charged to heretics hostile to the deity of Christ.”** See also Cloud’s remarks<sup>6 Part 2</sup>, including those on the heretical beliefs of Bruce Metzger.

Nestle omits **“which is in heaven”** but none of the earlier modern editors<sup>62</sup>, i.e. Griesbach et alia, appear to, showing that not even these bible critics were prepared to dismiss the phrase as **“an interpretive gloss, reflecting later Christological development.”**

All the pre-1611 bibles; Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops’<sup>138</sup> contain **“which is in heaven”** so this reading, like many others that White disputes, was part of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Protestant Reformation.

Dr Moorman cites in favour of the reading **“which is in heaven”** 21 uncials A, original and corrected, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Y,  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $\Theta$ ,  $\Pi$ ,  $\Psi$ , 047, 050, 055, 0141, 0211, and 063 with variation, i.e. twice as many uncial sources as White mentions, although White refers to uncials D, Q, N that Moorman does not. In addition to the majority of cursives and Families 1, 13, Dr Moorman lists the same 10 Old Latin sources that White does and the Vulgate but Moorman also includes the Peshitta Syriac that White neglects to mention. It should be remembered that the text of the Peshitta Syriac<sup>9 p 33</sup> predates P66 and P75. Moorman also lists as omitting the phrase P66, P75,  $\aleph$ , B, L, T, W, 083, 086, 0113 and a few or no cursives, 3 according to White – see above.

Dr Moorman also lists a total of 6 church fathers in favour of AV1611 reading for John 3:13 and none against it. See above. Dr Mr Riplinger<sup>39 p 739</sup> notes that **“which is in heaven”** as found in John 3:13 in the AV1611 is also found in the pre-700 AD Anglo-Saxon Bible.

Dr Moorman has this comment, which refutes White’s refusal to accept **“the heretical denial of the omnipresence of Christ through the “deletion” of the phrase, “which (who)**

is in heaven.”” The phrase “**which is in heaven**” has been deleted from the word of God and a “heretical denial of the omnipresence of Christ” has been issued thereby.

Dr Moorman notes that the phrase “**which is in heaven**” is “A statement of the Son of God’s omnipresence which though veiled during the days of His humiliation was nevertheless a glorious fact.”

The RV does not omit the phrase but Westcott and Hort omitted it from their Greek New Testament<sup>60 p 36</sup>. Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 132-5, 131</sup> has these comments with respect to Westcott and Hort’s omission of the phrase, his emphases, on John 3:13. His comments are likewise a rebuke to both White and Metzger. Note that Burgon addresses the “important witnesses against” “**which is in heaven**” that White fails to mention.

“At John iii. 13, we are informed that the last clause of that famous verse (‘...which is in heaven’) is not found ‘in many ancient authorities.’ But why...are we not **also** reminded that this...is a circumstance of **no textual significancy whatsoever?**

“Why, above all, are we not assured that the precious clause in question (ο ων εν τω ουρανω) is found in every MS. in the world, except five of bad character? – is recognized by **all** the Latin, and **all** the Syriac versions; as well as by the Coptic, - Ethiopic, - Georgian, - and Armenian? - is either quoted or insisted upon by Origen, - Hippolytus, - Athanasius, - Didymus, - Aphraates the Persian, - Basil the Great, - Epiphanius, - Nonnus, - [pseudo] Dionysius Alex., - Eustathius; - by Chrysostom, - Theodoret, - and Cyril, each 4 times; - by Paulus, Bishop of Emesa (in...AD 431); - by Theodorus Mops., - Amphilochius, - Severus, - Theodorus Heracl., - Basilius Cil., - Cosmas, - John Damascene, in 3 places, - and 4 other ancient Greek writers; - besides Ambrose, - Novatian, - Hilary, - Lucifer, - Victorinus, - Jerome, - Cassian, - Vigilus, - Zeno, - Marius, - Maximus Taur., - Capreolus, - Augustine, &c.: - is acknowledged by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf: in short, is **quite above suspicion**: why are we not told **that?** Those 10 Versions, those 38 Fathers, that host of Copies in the proportion of 995 to 5, - **why**, concerning all these is there not so much as a hint let fall that such a mass of counter-evidence exists?...Shame, - yes, **shame** on the learning which comes abroad only to perplex the weak, and to unsettle the doubting, and to mislead the blind! Shame, - yes **shame** on that two-thirds majority of well-intentioned but most incompetent men, who, - finding themselves (in an evil hour) appointed to correct “**plain and clear errors**” in the **English** ‘Authorized Version,’ – occupied themselves instead with **falsifying the inspired Greek Text** in countless places, and branding with suspicion some of the most precious utterances of the SPIRIT! Shame, - yes, **shame** upon them!”

White and Metzger were forced to acknowledge the weight of external evidence in favour of the phrase “**which is in heaven**” in John 3:13 but their statements reveal that they are, like Westcott and Hort, “most incompetent” and hardly “well-intentioned.”

Burgon has an informative note on the passage as follows, which answers Metzger’s Committee’s notions about an “interpretive gloss,” yet another of the “conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent” as Dr Hills<sup>65 p 110</sup> rightly observes.

“Let the reader, with a map spread before him, survey the whereabouts of the several VERSIONS above enumerated, and mentally assign each FATHER to his own approximate locality: then let him bear in mind that 995 out of 1000 of the extant MANUSCRIPTS agree with those Fathers and versions; and let him further recognize that those MSS. (executed at different dates in different countries) must severally represent independent remote originals, inasmuch as **no two of them are found to be quite alike**. – Next, let him consider that, **in all the Churches of the East**, these words from the earliest

period were read as part of the Gospel for the Thursday in Easter week. – This done, let him decide whether it is reasonable that two worshippers of CODEX B – AD 1881 – should attempt to thrust all this mass of ancient evidence clean out of sight by their peremptory sentence of exclusion, - ‘WESTERN AND SYRIAN.’

“Drs Westcott and Hort inform us that **‘the character of the attestation marks the clause (ο ων εν τω ουρανω) as a ‘WESTERN GLOSS.’** But the ‘attestation’ for retaining that clause – (a) Comes demonstrably from every quarter of ancient Christendom:- (b) Is more ancient (by 200 years) than the evidence for omitting it [the texts of the Old Latin and the Peshitta versions, the Fathers that even predate or are contemporaneous with P66, P75, discovered (in the city dump) after Burgon’s death]:- (c) Is more numerous, in the proportion of 99 to 1:- (d) In point of respectability, stands absolutely alone. For since we have **proved** that Origen and Didymus, Epiphanius and Cyril, Ambrose and Jerome, **recognize** the words in dispute, of what possible Textual significancy can it be if presently (**because it is sufficient for their purpose**) the same Fathers are observed to quote S. John iii. 13 **no further than down to the words ‘Son of Man’?** No person, (least of all a professed Critic,) who adds to his learning a few grains of common sense [sense is not common to White and Metzger] and a little candour, can be misled by such a circumstance. Origen, Eusebius, Proclus, Ephraem Syrus, Jerome, Marius, when they are only insisting on the doctrinal significancy of the earlier words, naturally end their quotation at this place. The two Gregories (Naz. ...: Nys. ...), writing against the Apolinarian heresy, of course quoted the verse than Apolinaris himself was accustomed (for his heresy) to adduce it...About the **internal** evidence for the clause; but **this** is simply overwhelming. We make our appeal to **Catholic Antiquity**; and are content to rest our case on **External Evidence**; - on COPIES, on VERSIONS, on FATHERS.”

It is hardly surprising that White and Metzger tried to belittle the external evidence in their efforts to subvert the words of God in this verse.

Burgon<sup>131</sup> has a summary comment about John 3:13 as follows, his emphases.

“[John] the Evangelist’s language was very differently taken by those heretics who systematically ‘maimed and misinterpreted that which belongeth to the human nature of Christ.’ Apolinarius, who relied on the present place [John 3:13], is found to have read it without the final clause (ο ων εν τω ουρανω [**“which is in heaven”**]); and certain of the orthodox (as Greg. Naz., Greg. Nyssa, Epiphanius, while contending with him,) shew themselves not unwilling to argue from the text so mutilated. Origen and the author of the *Dialogus* once, Eusebius twice, Cyril not fewer than nineteen times, also leave off at the words ‘even the Son of Man’: from which it is insecurely gathered that those Fathers disallowed the clause which follows. On the other hand, thirty-eight Fathers and ten Versions maintain the genuineness of the words ο ων εν τω ουρανω. But the decisive circumstance is that, — besides the Syriac and the Latin copies which all witness to the existence of the clause, — the whole body of the uncials, four only excepted (ⲚBLT), and every known cursive but one (33) — are for retaining it.”

Over a century of manuscripts discoveries since Burgon’s death have hardly altered Burgon’s observation. Codex W, which omits the phrase, was obtained in 1906<sup>65 p 170</sup> and the lone voice of cursive 33 has been augmented only by those of two additional miniscule manuscripts – see above.

Dr Ruckman<sup>1 p 50-6, 18 p 121-2</sup> has these comments on John 3:13.

“John 3:13. Here, the scribe who made Jesus into a “begotten god” (in John 1:18), now limits His presence to the earth, in fear that people will identify Him with God the Father.

*The entire last half of the verse is missing from Origen's fifth column [Origen appears to have quoted, or acknowledged, the missing words intermittently – see Burgon's remarks above – but evidently not in the source(s) used for  $\aleph$  and B], and subsequently is missing from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (the copies which were made from it). The correct reading is in the Authorized Version.... The last five words of the English text [**“which is in heaven”**], - “ο ων εν τω ουρανω,” (Greek) have all been omitted by Westcott and Hort...*

*“Exactly why Westcott and Hort, and Origen [and White and Metzger] could not grasp the verse is a little foggy, for the verse is applied to every born-again child of God, in Ephesians 2:1-7! We are IN Christ and He is IN Heaven, and we are seated with Him **“in heavenly places.”**”*

*“How did Origen, Westcott and Hort miss this truth? Were **they** “seated with Him in heavenly places”? If so, why did they not recognize the truth of John 3:13? (Where the Greek says one thing – W & H's “Greek” – and the English Bible says another, **throw out the Greek text!**)”*

Dr Ruckman explicitly addresses White's evaluation of John 3:13 as follows, his emphases.

*“This time Jimmy is “up a creek” ...when it comes to finding “another place somewhere” where Christ's omnipresence is stated in the NASV and NIV. **It is stated nowhere.** After alibiing a dozen times that it is alright to omit “Lord,” or “God,” or “Christ,” or “Jesus,” two dozen times **as long as the words appear “somewhere else,”** Jimmy suddenly drops the alibi<sup>3 p 46, 159</sup>. The Omnipresence of Christ doesn't **appear ANYWHERE else in the NASV or the NIV.** The **only place** where it occurred in the Greek manuscripts (John 3:13) was **OMITTED.**”*

*“Note the delicate touch of deception in the footnote citing Jay Green (The Gnostics, the New Versions, and the Deity of Christ, 1994). Jimmy says...*

*““while Green **ALLEGES** that the Gnostics tampered with the texts, he provides no **DIRECT EVIDENCE** that this is so.”*

*“Note the wording. Green and Hills<sup>110 p 76-8</sup> both gave **the verses that the Gnostics messed with...**The readings [under the heading *Gnostic Readings in Papyrus Bodmer III*, Dr Hills lists John 3:13 under *Heretical Readings In Codex Aleph*] are all in John (John 5:33, 8:34, 18:37, John 16:8, 10). Dr Hills [citing E. Massaux] says that Gnostic tampering “seems **clearly** discernible.” White was afraid to quote the **sources...**if he meant by “direct evidence” the **autograph** of a **known individual Gnostic**, actually altering a specific **Greek manuscript**, at a **specific time**, then White simply **blabbered NONSENSE.** Not one scholar on earth knows who wrote **Sinaiticus** or **Vaticanus**, and there is no “direct evidence” that any **Christian** wrote either one. Not one scholar on earth knows who the ten correctors of **Sinaiticus** were, where they lived, or **when** they made their corrections. White is as smooth, slippery, and treacherous as a greased coral snake.*

*“The “evidence” against Jesus Christ being in two places at the same time is P66 and P75,  $\aleph$ , and B, plus the usual **MINORITY** text of Aland-Metzger-Nestle. White says...*

*““One may well **PREFER** the reading of the Majority Text at this point...The patristic material favors the inclusion of the phrase, though there are important witnesses [which he doesn't dare list] against it. Still it is **ALWAYS** uncomfortable to go against P66 and P75 when they are united in a particular reading...”*

*“Why is it “uncomfortable” for you, Jimmy? You never checked P66 and P75 to see how “good” they were? We have. [Citing Zuntz and Colwell] “In summary, P66 and P75*

represent a controlled 'TRADITION'" ... "P66 is CARELESS AND INEFFECTIVE," so it lined up with  $\aleph$  and B on John 3:13. "The three papyri (P66, P75, and P46) created readings which can properly be called EDITORIAL [i.e. 'a controlled 'TRADITION']". And you feel "uncomfortable" do you, Jimmy, when you turn such garbage aside? We don't...

"It is White, in his ridiculous, superstitious naiveté who "shudders" at the thought of not taking P66 and P75 "seriously." That is because he is a hide-bound **traditionalist** who never examined either one of them. The following heretical readings, found in Sinaiticus, are backed up by P75<sup>110 p 76-7</sup>. John 3:13, 6:69, 9:35, and 9:38-39."

Dr Ruckman cites Dr Hills as follows, Dr Ruckman's emphases.

"The longer we ponder THE EVIDENCE of these important passages the more OBVIOUS it becomes that the texts of Papyrus 75 and  $\aleph$  were the HANDIWORK OF HERETICS. And the same seems to be true of B and the other manuscripts of the Alexandrian type. Long ago Burgon and Miller (1896) pointed out the **heretical** trait of  $\aleph$  and B (John 3:13) and their observations have never been refuted."

"White<sup>3 p 261</sup> simply "**asserted**" Miller didn't know what he was talking about:

"IT IS SURELY NO SIGN OF HERESY...TO FOLLOW THE LEAD OF THE TWO OLDEST WITNESSES TO THE GOSPEL OF JOHN."

"Someone is lying. Guess who?"

"Now let us patch things up for these mutilating, scissors-snapping, knife-cutting, Bible perverts. Let us give the evidence that they **omitted**... This is what White called "a calm examination of the facts" which he refused to examine.

1. Thirty-eight Church Fathers read as the **King James** text (John 3:13).
2. The words "which is in heaven" are found in the Latin versions, and all of the Syrian versions, that were extant one hundred years **before** Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (AD 140-400) were written).
3. All of the uncials but FIVE ( $\aleph$ , B, L, T, and W) have the **King James** reading.
4. The Coptic, the Ethiopic, the Georgian, and Armenian versions (400-900) all read with the **King James**, not the Minority Text of the NIV and NASV.
5. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles all grudgingly admit that the **King James** text was quoted by Origen (AD 200), Hippolytus (AD 234) and Didymus (AD 398) as well as Athanasius (AD 373).

"The "important" Church Fathers who were against the **King James** reading – the ones that White didn't dare list... - were Eusebius, Proclus, Jerome, and Marius. The two Gregories (Nyssa and Nazianzus) don't **finish** quoting the verse, but they quit where Epiphanius quit because all three of them were dealing with a heresy taught by Apolinarius, and **he** only used the **first part of the verse** in his teaching. They stopped at "**man**" because that is where Apolinarius stopped. So did the ASV,...RSV, NRSV, NASV, and NIV. "Birds of a feather"..."

"White's only reason for attempting to justify the text, was a remark by Hort regarding the manuscript evidence:

"The CHARACTER of the attestation [ $\aleph$ , B, P66 and P75 – Man! what CHARACTER!!] marks the clause (John 3:13) as a WESTERN GLOSS"..." See Burgon's remarks above. Dr Ruckman continues.

“Who on this earth...would think that **Syria** was in “the WEST?” All the Syrian translations read with the **King James**. And what is Didymus doing quoting the **King James**? He was from the East. And what cartographer on earth would draw a map of the Middle East and put **Georgia** and **Armenia** WEST of Constantinople?...Is Alexandria in the WEST? [the location of ⲁ, B, P66 and P75 that all omit the clause]...

“Burgon (whom White called a “true scholar”<sup>3 p 91</sup> of the “first rank”) says of White’s John 3:13 reading:

“**Shame** on the learning which comes abroad only to perplex the weak, and to unsettle the doubting, and to mislead the blind! Shame, - yes **shame** on that two-thirds majority of well-intentioned but most incompetent men, who, - finding themselves (in an evil hour) appointed to correct “**plain and clear errors**” in the **English** ‘Authorized Version,’ – occupied themselves instead with **falsifying the inspired Greek Text** in countless places, and branding with suspicion some of the most precious utterances of the SPIRIT! Shame,- yes, **shame** upon them!” ...

“Burgon documents a perfect, unbroken chain of testimony for the **King James**’ text of John 3:13 on three continents, in more than **seven** languages, through a period of 1,400 years. This means that any fool can “comfortably” toss P66 and P75 into St Catherine’s wastebasket anytime they feel like it. That is where Tischendorf found Sinaiticus (ⲁ).”

“**We are fools for Christ’s sake**” 1 Corinthians 4:10a.

White’s next target is the expression “**in me**” in John 6:47. This reading has been discussed at length in **Chapter 7**, which see.

White<sup>3 p 262</sup> then attacks John 7:53-8:11, known as *The Pericope De Adultera* or *The Passage of the Adulterous Woman*.

White insists that, “The evidence against the originality of this [passage] is extensive and wide-ranging, including both external and internal elements. Externally...the passage is omitted by a truly diverse group of ancient manuscripts, including P66 P75 ⲁ B L N T W Δ Θ Ψ 0141 33 157 565 1241 1333\* [original reading] 1424, the majority of lectionaries, Latin versions, and Syriac versions. Both A and C probably did not contain the passage...Other manuscripts that do contain the passage mark it off with asterisks or obeli [plural of *obelus*, marginal note indicating that a word or passage in a manuscript is spurious]...In the manuscripts that contain the passage, it is normally found after John 7:52. However, in ms. 225 it is found after 7:36; in others after 7:44; in a group of others after John 21:25, and in f<sup>13</sup> it is not even found in John, but after Luke 21:38! Such moving about by a body of text is plain evidence of its later origin and the attempt on the part of scribes to find a place where it “fits.” Such is not the earmark of an original passage in the Gospel.

“The primary internal consideration...is to be found in the fact that John 7:52 and John 8:12 “go together.” The story of the woman taken in adultery interrupts the flow of the text and the events recorded by John regarding Jesus’ ministry (John 7:45-8:20).

“All of these things taken together make it a near certainty that the passage was not originally a part of the Gospel of John...Most feel it was an early oral tradition that was popular primarily in the West and that it came to have a part in the Gospel of John over time.”

Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford omit the passage<sup>62</sup> and Griesbach regards it as doubtful, as does Nestle – see below. Westcott and Hort’s RV contains the passage but their Greek text indicates that it is doubtful<sup>160 p 30</sup>.



The bibles of Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all contain the passage, indicating that, regardless of James White's later opinion, God honoured John 7:53-8:11 as scripture during the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation and before, in the lead-up to the Reformation.

This author's earlier work<sup>8 p 44-5, 74-5</sup> contains a summary of the witnesses for and against the passage, including a summary statement from Dean Burgon. See below, with updated references. Note that once again, White is in essential agreement with Rome and Watchtower. As usual, White has not given all the relevant evidence.

***“John 7:53-8:11***

*“The NIV notes in its text that the earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have John 7:53-8:11.*

*“The NKJV notes in its margin [footnote] that the verses are not regarded as original by the Nestle-United Bible Societies text but are found in over 900 manuscripts.*

*“The NWT places the passage in the margin [footnote].*

*“The JB notes in the margin [footnote] that on the basis of style, the author is not John and that the oldest manuscripts do not contain the passage.*

*“Fuller<sup>12 p 123-124, 64 p 155</sup> cites Burgon as stating that of 73 copies of John's Gospel in the British Museum, 61 contain John 7:53-8:11 as found in the AV1611. Burgon<sup>64 p 155</sup> indicates that this proportioning would be typical for any collection of manuscript copies of John. He also cites<sup>64 p 149</sup> a further 60 copies, from three distinct lines of ancestry, which agree with the AV1611. He alludes to 35 of the BM copies, which contain a marginal note stating that verses 1-11 are not to be read on Whitsunday. Thus he explains how the Lectionary practice of the early church would have accounted for the omission of the verses from some of the seventy cursives from which they are absent. He also states<sup>64 p 148</sup> that the subject matter itself would have been sufficient for deletion of the words from many copies, including the oldest uncials, Aleph and B. The verses are also absent from A (5<sup>th</sup> century), L (8<sup>th</sup> century), T (5<sup>th</sup> century) and Delta (9<sup>th</sup> century) but Codex A has two leaves missing, which in Burgon's considered view would have contained the verses, while L and Delta exhibit blank spaces which are witnesses FOR, not against, the validity of the verses. See remarks on B in relation to Mark 16:9-20. This leaves only T in agreement with Aleph and B, both notoriously untrustworthy.*

*“Burgon<sup>64 p 156</sup>, states that the verses are to be found in the large majority of later copies (i.e. over 900 manuscripts, as the NKJV so obligingly notes.)*

*“Hills<sup>65 p 159, 110 p 131</sup> states that Papyri 66 and 75 and W omit the verses, in addition to the sources cited by Burgon. D however (6<sup>th</sup> century), contains them. Burgon<sup>64 p 145-146 153-154</sup> also cites in favour of the passage as found in the AV1611:*

*“Codex D and the Old Latin codices b, c, e ff, g, h, j - see notes under John 5:3b-4 for dates. Note that the Old Latin TEXT dates from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century<sup>18 p 77</sup>*

*“Jerome (385 AD), who included it in the Vulgate after surveying older Greek copies, stating it was found “in many copies both Greek and Latin”, before 415 AD<sup>18 p 134</sup>*

*“The Ethiopic (5<sup>th</sup> century), Palestinian Syriac (5<sup>th</sup> century), Georgian (5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> centuries), some copies of the Armenian (4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> centuries), Slavonic, Arabic and Persian versions*

*“Ambrose (374 AD), Augustine (396), Chrysologus (433), Faustus (400), Gelasius (492), Pacian (370), Rufinus (400), Sedulius (434), Victorius (457), Vigilius (484) and others*

*“The Lectionary practice of the Eastern Church, from earliest times (i.e. the 2<sup>nd</sup> century).*

*“Ruckman<sup>18 p 134</sup> cites in favour of the passage, the Didache (3<sup>rd</sup> century document of Apostolic Teachings), Apostolic Constitutions (4<sup>th</sup> century) and Eusebius (324 AD) citing Papias (150 AD) as recognising the passage. The Montanists (2<sup>nd</sup> century) were also aware of the passage. Ruckman<sup>171 p 333</sup> also cites besides D, uncials M, S and Gamma from the 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries in favour of the AV1611.*

*“Concerning authorship of the passage (see note under JB), Hills<sup>110 p 130</sup> states that “arguments from style are notoriously weak.”*

*“Burgon showed that:*

*““An omission which owed its beginning to a moral scruple was eventually extended for a liturgical consideration and resulted in severing twelve verses of St. John’s Gospel - chapter 7:53-8:11 - from their lawful context”<sup>64 p 148-149</sup>. However, he states that “Jerome, who was familiar with Greek mss. (and who handled none of later date than B and Aleph), expressly related that (the passage) “is found in many copies both Greek and Latin”<sup>64 p 146</sup>.”*

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 105</sup> lists uncials X, Y, 0211 as not containing the passage in addition to those that White lists above, i.e. a total of 15, in addition to P66, P75. Moorman also indicates that ‘some’ cursives omit the passage – White listed 6. Moorman lists 5 Old Latin sources that omit the passage, together with the Peshitta Syriac and the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible.

The main witnesses that he lists as containing the passage are D, E, F with variation, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Λ, Π, Ω, 047, 055, and possibly 0233, or up to 16 uncials, i.e. approximately as many as the number that omit the passage, which include, according to Burgon, known disreputable witnesses such as 8, B, L. (Dr Moorman includes T as one of the witnesses for John 7:53-8:11 but this insertion seems to have been inadvertent.)

Dr Moorman lists the majority of cursives in favour of the passage and Families 1, 13, both of which misplace the passage. He also lists 10 Old Latin witnesses as containing John 7:53-8:11, one of which has the reading in its margin.

Dr Moorman includes this note about the *Pericope*, which effectively counters White’s notion that “John 7:52 and John 8:12 “go together.””

*“If 7:53-8:11 is removed, the narrative abruptly switches from a dispute involving Nicodemus in a Sanhedrin council chamber to Christ openly declaring in the Temple that He is the Light of the World. Thus we go from “out of Galilee ariseth no prophet” to “I am the Light of the World” without the barest connective or explanation. The passage has substantial external support. The statement of Augustine (c. 400) is well known: “Certain persons of little faith, or rather enemies of the true faith, fearing, I suppose, lest their wives should be given impunity in sinning, removed from their manuscripts the Lord’s act of forgiveness toward the adulteress, as if He who had said ‘sin no more’ had granted permission to sin.”*

*“In the reading of Scripture faith is always put to the test. Is Christ such a sufficient Saviour and is His work on the cross so utterly “Finished” that He can and does forgive even the scarlet sin? For a full defence see the works of Burgon and Hills.”*

A summary evaluation of these works will follow but note first that if 900 manuscripts contain John 7:53-8:11 and perhaps less than 30 of these exhibit displacement of the passage, according to White’s statement, “in ms. 225 it is found after 7:36; in others after

7:44; in a group of others after John 21:25 [i.e. Family 1, of 6 (5+) manuscripts], and in  $f^{43}$  it is not even found in John, but after Luke 21:38!" how does such a small proportion of the total, less than 4%, justify White's conclusion?

*"Such moving about by a body of text is plain evidence of its later origin and the attempt on the part of scribes to find a place where it "fits." Such is not the earmark of an original passage in the Gospel."*

James White does not provide a satisfactory answer.

Dr Thomas Holland<sup>55 p 155-6, Online Source</sup> has a helpful summary of the textual witnesses for and against John 7:53-8:11, including 5 cursives that omit the passage but are not listed by White, who nevertheless lists 2 cursives that Dr Holland does not; 1333, 1424. However, the early citations for the passage that Dr Holland gives, *as scripture* – see also summary above – show that White is wrong to suppose that John 7:53-8:11 *"was an early oral tradition that...came to have a part in the Gospel of John over time."*

His conclusion, with respect to the statement of Augustine, is apposite.

*"Among textual critics, this passage is designated Pericope De Adultera and refers to the woman caught in the act of adultery. The passage has long been questioned as genuine and is omitted in a great number of manuscripts. It is, of course, removed from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as well as L, N, T, W, X, Y D, Q, Y, 053, and 0141 among the uncial manuscripts. It is also missing from several of the minuscule manuscripts; 22, 33, 157, 209, 565, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1253, and 2193.*

*"However, the passage is in numerous uncials, including Codex D (Bezae Cantabrigiensis), G, H, K, M, U, and Γ. Among the minuscule/cursive manuscripts it is in 28, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148, and 2174. Most Greek manuscripts contain this passage. It also is in early translations such as the Bohairic Coptic Version, the Syriac Palestinian Version and the Ethiopic Version, all of which date from the second to the sixth centuries, as well as in the majority of the Old Latin manuscripts and the Latin Vulgate by Jerome.*

*"Further, the passage is cited by a number of Church Fathers. Among them are Didascalia (third century), Ambrosiaster (fourth century), Ambrose (fourth century), and is in the Apostolic Constitutions, which are the largest liturgical Collections of writings from Antioch Syria in about 380 AD.*

*"This passage is found in all the early English versions and the major translations of the Reformation." See above for the pre-1611 bibles that contain the passage, which inclusion God clearly honoured with the English Reformation. Dr Holland continues.*

*"Most textual scholars consider the evidence against it to be overwhelming and reject the reading as original. Yet the passage still finds its way into the text of the majority of contemporary translations...If the evidence against it is so convincing and the text is not considered genuine, should not this entire passage be removed from the text itself as other shorter passages are? If one is to remove smaller sections, would not consistency demand the same be done with larger sections if the amount of textual evidence is either the same or greater?..."*

*"Supporters of the Textus Receptus and the Majority Text...have soundly defended the authenticity of this passage. The vast majority of all known Greek manuscripts contain this section. It is clearly part of the Traditional Text. Additionally, the internal evidence demonstrates this passage is original. If we remove it we have a very erratic jump in textual thought."*

Dr Holland is correct. Inspection of John 7:52 and 8:12 show that they do not ““go together,”” as White maintains. The Lord is absent from John 7:52 but suddenly present, if the intervening passage is omitted. Dr Holland continues.

*“The question arises as to why this passage was ever omitted. We find the answer in church history. Saint Augustine (430 AD) makes an astounding statement concerning the authenticity of this passage. After citing the forgiving phrase from Christ, “Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more,” Augustine writes:*

*““This proceeding, however, shocks the minds of some weak believers, or rather unbelievers and enemies of the Christian faith: inasmuch that, after (I suppose) of its giving their wives impunity of sinning, they struck out from their copies of the Gospel this that our Lord did in pardoning the woman taken in adultery: as if He granted leave of sinning, Who said, Go and sin no more!” (Saint Augustine, De Conjug. Adult., II:6.).”*

*“Augustine implies some fearful scribes who thought the inclusion might lead to adultery omitted this passage. The argument not only seems logical, but also consistent with human nature. It is, at least, as good as modern scholarship’s view that the passage was added as a piece of oral tradition apart from inspiration.”*

And at least as good, if not better, than White’s speculations.

Dr Hills<sup>65 p 150-9</sup> and Dean Burgon<sup>131</sup> have comprehensive statements on John 7:53-8:11 that refute in detail all of White’s objections to John 7:53-8:11. Why did White not check their works, insofar as he had access to them?

Dr Hills states as follows.

***“The Woman Taken In Adultery (John 7:53-8:11)***

***“(a) Ancient Testimony Concerning the Pericope de Adultera (John 7:53-8:11)***

*“That early Greek manuscripts contained this pericope de adultera is proved by the presence of it in the 5th-century Greek manuscript D. That early Latin manuscripts also contained it is indicated by its actual appearance in the Old Latin codices b and e. And both these conclusions are confirmed by the statement of Jerome (c. 415) that “in the Gospel according to John in many manuscripts, both Greek and Latin, is found the story of the adulterous woman who was accused before the Lord.” There is no reason to question the accuracy of Jerome’s statement, especially since another statement of his concerning an addition made to the ending of Mark has been proved to have been correct by the actual discovery of the additional material in W. And that Jerome personally accepted the pericope de adultera as genuine is shown by the fact that he included it in the Latin Vulgate.*

*“Another evidence of the presence of the pericope de adultera in early Greek manuscripts of John is the citation of it in the Didascalia (Teaching) of the Apostles and in the Apostolic Constitutions, which are based on the Didascalia.*

*“...to do as He also did with her that had sinned, whom the elders set before Him, and leaving the judgment in His hands departed. But He, the Searcher of Hearts, asked her and said to her, ‘Have the elders condemned thee, my daughter?’ She saith to Him, ‘Nay, Lord.’ And He said unto her, ‘Go thy way: Neither do I condemn thee.’”*

*“In these two documents (from the 3rd and 4th centuries respectively) bishops are urged to extend forgiveness to penitent sinners. After many passages of Scripture have been cited to enforce this plea, the climax is reached in the supreme example of divine mercy, namely, the compassion which Christ showed to the woman taken in adultery. Tischen-*

dorf admitted that this citation was taken from the Gospel of John. "Although," he wrote, "the Apostolic Constitutions do not actually name John as the author of this story of the adulteress, in vain would anyone claim that they could have derived this story from any other source"... James White of course did. Dr Hills continues.

"Also the Spanish Father Pacian (c. 370) appealed to the pericope de adultera when protesting against excessive severity in discipline. "Are you not willing," he asked, "to read in the Gospel that the Lord also spared the adulteress who confessed, whom no man had condemned?"

**"b) What the Facts of History Indicate**

"The facts of history indicate that during the early Christian centuries throughout the Church adultery was commonly regarded as such a serious sin that it could be forgiven, if at all, only after severe penance. For example, Cyprian (c. 250) says that certain bishops who preceded him in the province of North Africa "thought that reconciliation ought not to be given to adulterers and allowed to conjugal infidelity no place at all for repentance." Hence offence was taken at the story of the adulterous woman brought to Christ, because she seemed to have received pardon too easily. Such being the case, it is surely more reasonable to believe that this story was deleted from John's Gospel by overzealous disciplinarians than to suppose that a narrative so contrary to the ascetic outlook of the early Christian Church was added to John's Gospel from some extra-canonical source. There would be a strong motive for deleting it but no motive at all for adding it, and the prejudice against it would make its insertion into the Gospel text very difficult.

"Not only conservatives but also clear thinking radical scholars have perceived that the historical evidence favors the belief that the pericope de adultera was deleted from the text of the fourth Gospel rather than added to it. "The bold presentation of the evangelist," Hilgenfeld (1875) observed, "must at an early date, especially in the Orient have seemed very offensive." Hence Hilgenfeld regarded Augustine's statement that the passage had been deleted by over scrupulous scribes "as altogether not improbable." And Steck (1893) suggested that the story of the adulteress was incorporated in the Gospel of John before it was first published. "That it later," concluded Steck, "was set aside out of moral prudery is easily understandable."

"Rendel Harris (1891) was convinced that the Montanists, an ascetic Christian sect which flourished during the 2nd century, were acquainted with the pericope de adultera. "The Montanist Churches," he wrote, "either did not receive this addition to the text, or else they are responsible for its omission; but at the same time it can be shown that they knew of the passage perfectly well in the West; for the Latin glossator of the Acts has borrowed a few words from the section in Acts 5:18. In Acts 5:18 we are told that the rulers laid their hands on the apostles and put them in the common prison. To this verse the Latin portion of D adds, and they went away each one to his house. As Harris observes, this addition is obviously taken from the description of the breaking up of the council meeting in John 7:53. If the Montanists were the ones who added these words to Acts 5:18, then the pericope de adultera must have been part of John's Gospel at a very early date.

"Naturalistic scholars who insist that John 7:53-8:11 is an addition to the Gospel text can maintain their position only by ignoring the facts, by disregarding what the ancient writers say about this pericope de adultera and emphasizing the silence of other ancient writers who say nothing about it at all. This is what Hort did in his Introduction (1881). Here the testimony of Ambrose and Augustine is barely mentioned.... Contrary to the

evidence Hort insisted that the *pericope de adultera* was not offensive to the early Church. “Few in ancient times, there is reason to think, would have found the section a stumbling block except Montanists and Novatians.” With the implications of this sweeping statement, however, Rendel Harris could not agree. “Evidently,” he observed, “Dr. Hort did not think that the tampering of the Montanists with the text amounted to much; we, on the contrary, have reason to believe that it was a very far reaching influence.”

**“(c) Misleading Notes in the Modern Versions**

*“The notes printed in the modern versions regarding John 7:53 - 8:11 are completely misleading...These notes imply that originally the story of the adulteress circulated as an independent narrative in many forms and that later, when scribes began to add it to the New Testament, they couldn’t agree on where to put it, some inserting it at one place and others at another.*

*“Von Soden (1902) showed long ago that the view implied by these notes is entirely erroneous. Although this scholar denied the genuineness of John 7:53 - 8:11, nevertheless, in his monumental study of this passage he was eminently fair in his presentation of the facts. After mentioning that this section is sometimes found at the end of the Gospel of John and sometimes in the margin near John 7:52 and that in one group of manuscripts (the Ferrar group) the section is inserted after Luke 21:38, von Soden continues as follows: “But in the great majority of the manuscripts it stands in the text between 7:52 and 8:12 except that in at least half of these manuscripts it is provided with deletion marks in the margin.” Thus the usual location of the *pericope de adultera* is in John between 7:52 and 8:12. The manuscripts which have it in any other place are exceptions to the rule.*

*““The *pericope*,” says Metzger (1964), “is obviously a piece of floating tradition which circulated in certain parts of the Western Church. It was subsequently inserted into various manuscripts at various places.” But Metzger’s interpretation of the facts is incorrect, as von Soden demonstrated long ago by his careful scholarship. Von Soden showed that the usual location of the *pericope de adultera* was also its original location in the New Testament text. The other positions which it sometimes occupies and the unusually large number of variant readings which it contains were later developments which took place after it became part of the New Testament. “In spite of the abundance of the variant readings,” he declared, “it has been established with certainty that the *pericope* was not intruded into the Four Gospels, perhaps in various forms, in various places. This hypothesis is already contradicted by the fixed place which the section has, against which the well known, solitary exception of the common ancestor of the so-called Ferrar group can prove nothing. On the contrary, when the *pericope*, at a definite time and at a definite place was first incorporated into the Four Gospels, in order then to defend its place with varying success against all attacks, it had the following wording.” And then von Soden goes on to give his reconstruction of the original form of the *pericope de adultera*. This does not differ materially from the form printed in the *Textus Receptus* and the King James Version.*

*“Also the opening verses (John 7:53-8:2) of the *pericope de adultera* indicate clearly that its original position in the New Testament was in John between 7:52 and 8:12, for this is the only location in which these introductory verses fit the context. The first of them (John 7:53) describes the breaking up of the stormy council meeting which immediately precedes. The next two verses (John 8:1-2) tell us what Jesus did in the meantime and thereafter. And thus a transition is made to the story of the woman taken in adultery. But in those other locations...which the *pericope de adultera* occupies in a relatively few*

*manuscripts, these introductory verses make no sense and thus prove conclusively that the pericope has been misplaced.*

*“Long ago Burgon pointed out how untrustworthy some of those manuscripts are which misplace the pericope de adultera. “The Critics eagerly remind us that in four cursive copies (the Ferrar group) the verses in question are found tacked on to the end of Luke 21. But have they forgotten that ‘these four codexes are derived from a common archetype,’ and therefore represent one and the same ancient and, I may add, corrupt copy? The same Critics are reminded that in the same four Codexes ‘the agony and bloody sweat’ (St. Luke 22:43-44) is found thrust into St. Matthew’s Gospel between ch. 26:39 and 40. Such licentiousness on the part of a solitary exemplar of the Gospels no more affects the proper place of these or of those verses than the superfluous digits of a certain man of Gath avail to disturb the induction that to either hand of a human being appertain but five fingers and to either foot but five toes.””*

***“(d) The Silence of the Greek Fathers Explained***

*“The arguments of naturalistic critics against the genuineness of John 7:53-8:11 are largely arguments from silence, and the strongest of these silences is generally thought to be that of the Greek Church Fathers. Metzger (1964) speaks of it as follows: “Even more significant is the fact that no Greek Church Father for a thousand years after Christ refers to the pericope, including even those who, like Origen, Chrysostom, and Nonnus (in his metrical paraphrase) dealt with the entire Gospel verse by verse. Euthymius Zigabenus, who lived in the first part of the twelfth century, is the first Greek writer to comment on the passage, and even he declares that the accurate copies of the Gospel do not contain it.”*

*“This argument, however, is not nearly so strong as Metzger makes it seem. In the first place, as Burgon pointed out long ago, we must knock off at least three centuries from this thousand-year period of which Metzger speaks so ominously. For Tischendorf lists 9 manuscripts of the 9th century which contain the pericope de adultera in its usual place and also one which may be of the 8<sup>th</sup> century. And so the silence of the Greek Church Fathers during the last third of this thousand year period couldn’t have been because they didn’t know of manuscripts which contained John 7:53-8:11 in the position which it now occupies in the great majority of the New Testament manuscripts. The later Greek Fathers didn’t comment on these verses mainly because the earlier Greek Fathers hadn’t done so.*

*“But neither does the silence of the earlier Greek Fathers, such as Origen (c. 230), Chrysostom (c. 400), and Nonnus (c. 400), necessarily imply that these ancient Bible scholars did not know of the pericope de adultera as part of the Gospel of John. For they may have been influenced against it by the moralistic prejudice of which we have spoken and also by the fact that some of the manuscripts known to them omitted it. And Burgon mentions another very good reason why these early Fathers failed to comment on this section. Their commenting was in connection with their preaching, and their preaching would be affected by the fact that the pericope de adultera was omitted from the ancient Pentecostal lesson of the Church.*

*““Now for the first time, it becomes abundantly plain, why Chrysostom and Cyril, in publicly commenting on St. John’s Gospel, pass straight from ch. 7:52 to ch. 8:12. Of course they do. Why should they, — how could they, — comment on what was not publicly read before the congregation? The same thing is related (in a well-known ‘scholium’) to have been done by Apolinarius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Origen also,*

*for aught I care, — though the adverse critics have no right to claim him, seeing that his commentary on all that part of St. John's Gospel is lost, — but Origen's name, as I was saying, for aught I care, may be added to those who did the same thing."*

*"At a very early date it had become customary throughout the Church to read John 7:37-8:12 on the day of Pentecost. This lesson began with John 7:37-39, verses very appropriate to the great Christian feast day in which the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is commemorated: In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink . . . But this spake He of the Spirit which they that believe on Him should receive. Then the lesson continued through John 7:52, omitted John 7:53-8:11, and concluded with John 8:12, Again therefore Jesus spake unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. Thus the fact that the pericope de adultera was not publicly read at Pentecost was an additional reason why the early Greek Church Fathers did not comment on it.*

*"Why was the story of the adulteress omitted from the Pentecostal lesson? Obviously because it was inappropriate to the central idea of Pentecost. But critics have another explanation. According to them, the passage was not part of the Gospel of John at the time that the Pentecostal lesson was selected. But, as Burgon pointed out, this makes it more difficult than ever to explain how this passage came to be placed after John 7:52. Why would a scribe introduce this story about an adulteress into the midst of the ancient lesson for Pentecost? How would it occur to anyone to do this?"*

*"Moreover, although the Greek Fathers were silent about the pericope de adultera, the Church was not silent. This is shown by the fact that John 8:3-11 was chosen as the lesson to be read publicly each year on St. Pelagia's day, October 8. Burgon points out the significance of this historical circumstance. "The great Eastern Church speaks out on this subject in a voice of thunder. In all her Patriarchates, as far back as the written records of her practice reach, — and they reach back to the time of those very Fathers whose silence was felt to be embarrassing, — the Eastern Church has selected nine out of these twelve verses to be the special lesson for October 8."*

#### ***"(e) The Internal Evidence***

*"Naturalistic critics have tried to argue against the genuineness of John 7:53-8:11 on the basis of the internal evidence. Colwell (1952), for example, claims that the story of the woman taken in adultery does not fit its context and that it differs in its vocabulary and general tone from the rest of John's Gospel. But by these arguments the critics only create new difficulties for themselves. For if the pericope de adultera is an interpolation and if it is so markedly out of harmony with its context and with the rest of the Gospel of John, why was it ever placed in the position which it now occupies? This is the question which Steck (1893) (58) asked long ago, and it has never been answered.*

*"Actually, however, there is little substance to these charges. Arguments from literary style are notoriously weak. They have been used to prove all sorts of things. And Burgon long ago pointed out expressions in this passage which are characteristic of John's Gospel. "We note how entirely in St. John's manner is the little explanatory clause in ver. 6, — 'This they said, tempting Him that they might have to accuse Him.' We are struck besides by the prominence given in verses 6 and 8 to the act of writing, — allusions to which, are met with in every work of the last Evangelist."*

*"As for not fitting the context, Burgon shows that the actual situation is just the reverse. When the pericope de adultera is omitted, it leaves a hole, a gaping wound that cannot be*



healed. "Note that in the oracular Codexes B and Aleph immediate transition is made from the words 'out of Galilee ariseth no prophet,' in ch. 7:52, to the words 'Again therefore JESUS spake unto them, saying,' in ch. 8:12. And we are invited by all the adverse Critics alike to believe that so the place stood in the inspired autograph of the Evangelist.

"But the thing is incredible. Look back at what is contained between ch. 7:37 and 52, and note — (a) That two hostile parties crowded the Temple courts (ver. 40-42); (b) That some were for laying violent hands on our LORD (ver. 44); (c) That the Sanhedrin, being assembled in debate, were reproaching their servants for not having brought Him prisoner, and disputing one against another (ver. 45-52). How can the Evangelist have proceeded, — 'Again therefore JESUS spake unto them, saying, I am the light of the world'? What is it supposed then that St. John meant when he wrote such words?"

"Surely the Dean's point is well taken. Who can deny that when John 7:53-8:11 is rejected, the want of connection between the seventh and eighth chapters is exceedingly strange? The reader is snatched from the midst of a dispute in the council chamber of the Sanhedrin back to Jesus in the Temple without a single word of explanation. Such impressionistic writing might possibly be looked for in some sophisticated modern book but not in a book of the sacred Scriptures.

***(f) The Negative Evidence of the Manuscripts and Versions Explained***

"It is not surprising that the pericope de adultera is omitted in Papyri 66 and 75, Aleph B W and L. For all these manuscripts are connected with the Alexandrian tradition which habitually favored omissions. When once the Montanists or some other extreme group had begun to leave the story of the adulteress out of their copies of John's Gospel, the ascetic tendencies of the early Church were such that the practice would spread rapidly, especially in Egypt, and produce just the situation which we find among the Greek manuscripts. For the same reason many manuscripts of the Coptic (Egyptian) versions, including the recently discovered Bodmer Papyrus III, omit this passage, as do also the Syriac and Armenian versions. All these versions reflect the tendency to omit a passage which had become offensive. And the fact that the section had been so widely omitted encouraged later scribes to play the critic, and thus were produced the unusually large number of variant readings which appear in this passage in the extant manuscripts. And for the same cause many scribes placed deletion marks on the margin opposite this section.

"None of these phenomena proves that the pericope de adultera is not genuine but merely that there was a widespread prejudice against it in the early Church. The existence of this prejudice makes it more reasonable to suppose that the story of the adulteress was omitted from the text of John than to insist that in the face of this prejudice it was added to the text of John. There would be a motive for omitting it but no motive for adding it."

As indicated, Dean Burgon carried out a truly thorough investigation into John 7:53-8:11. More of his searching comments merit attention, in addition to those already given above in support of this passage. Note that some repetition of the Dean's remarks quoted earlier is necessary in order to preserve continuity. The Dean writes as follows.

"The only uncial MSS. therefore which simply leave out the pericope, are the three following —  $\aleph$ BT: and the degree of attention to which such an amount of evidence is entitled, has been already proved to be wondrous small. We cannot forget moreover that the two former of these copies enjoy the unenviable distinction of standing alone on a memorable occasion:— they alone exhibit St. Mark's Gospel mutilated in respect of its twelve concluding verses.

*“But I shall be reminded that about seventy MSS. of later date are without the pericope de adultera: that the first Greek Father who quotes the pericope is Euthymius in the twelfth century: that Tertullian, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, Nonnus, Cosmas, Theophylact, knew nothing of it: and that it is not contained in the Syriac, the Gothic, or the Egyptian versions. Concerning every one of which statements I remark over again that no sincere lover of Truth [Note White’s<sup>3 p 95, 247</sup> exhortations, “Christians are to be lovers of truth,” “A true Christian scholar is a lover of truth.” Why, then, didn’t White allude to Burgon’s work on John 7:53-8:11?], supposing him to understand the matter about which he is disputing, could so exhibit the evidence for this particular problem [White did]. First, because so to state it is to misrepresent the entire case. Next, because some of the articles of indictment are only half true:— in fact are untrue. But chiefly, because in the foregoing enumeration certain considerations are actually suppressed which, had they been fairly stated, would have been found to reverse the issue. Let me now be permitted to conduct this inquiry in my own way.*

*“The first thing to be done is to enable the reader clearly to understand what the problem before him actually is. Twelve verses then, which, as a matter of fact, are found dovetailed into a certain context of St. John’s Gospel, the Critics insist must now be dislodged. But do the Critics in question prove that they must? For unless they do, there is no help for it but the pericope de adultera must be left where it is. I proceed to shew first, that it is impossible, on any rational principle to dislodge these twelve verses from their actual context. — Next, I shall point out that the facts adduced in evidence and relied on by the assailants of the passage, do not by any means prove the point they are intended to prove; but admit of a sufficient and satisfactory explanation. — Thirdly, it shall be shewn that the said explanation carries with it, and implies, a weight of testimony in support of the twelve verses in dispute, which is absolutely overwhelming. — Lastly, the positive evidence in favour of these twelve verses shall be proved to outweigh largely the negative evidence, which is relied upon by those who contend for their removal. To some people I may seem to express myself with too much confidence. Let it then be said once for all, that my confidence is inspired by the strength of the arguments which are now to be unfolded. When the Author of Holy Scripture supplies such proofs of His intentions, I cannot do otherwise than rest implicit confidence in them.*

*“Now I begin by establishing as my first proposition that,*

*“(1) These twelve verses occupied precisely the same position which they now occupy from the earliest period to which evidence concerning the Gospels reaches.*

*“And this, because it is a mere matter of fact, is sufficiently established by reference to the ancient Latin version of St. John’s Gospel. We are thus carried back to the second century of our era: beyond which, testimony does not reach. The pericope is observed to stand in situ in Codd. b c e ff<sup>2</sup> g h j. Jerome (A.D. 385), after a careful survey of older Greek copies, did not hesitate to retain it in the Vulgate. It is freely referred to and commented on by himself in Palestine: while Ambrose at Milan (374) quotes it at least nine times; as well as Augustine in North Africa (396) about twice as often. It is quoted besides by Pacian, in the north of Spain (370), — by Faustus the African (400), — by Rufinus, at Aquileia (400), — by Chrysologus, at Ravenna (433), — by Sedulius, a Scot (434). The unknown authors of two famous treatises, written at the same period, largely quote this portion of the narrative. It is referred to by Victorius or Victorinus (457), — by Vigilius of Tapsus (484) in North Africa, — by Gelasius, bp. of Rome (492), — by Cassiodorus in Southern Italy, — by Gregory the Great, and by other Fathers of the Western Church.*

*“To this it is idle to object that the authors cited all wrote in Latin. For the purpose in hand their evidence is every bit as conclusive as if they had written in Greek, — from which language no one doubts that they derived their knowledge, through a translation. But in fact we are not left to Latin authorities. [Out of thirty-eight copies of the Bohairic version the pericope de adultera is read in fifteen, but in three forms which will be printed in the Oxford edition. In the remaining twenty-three, it is left out.] How is it intelligible that this passage is thus found in nearly half the copies — except on the hypothesis that they formed an integral part of the Memphitic version? They might have been easily omitted: but how could they have been inserted?”*

*“Once more. The Ethiopic version (fifth century), — the Palestinian Syriac (which is referred to the fifth century), — the Georgian (probably fifth or sixth century), — to say nothing of the Slavonic, Arabic and Persian versions, which are of later date, — all contain the portion of narrative in dispute. The Armenian version also (fourth–fifth century) originally contained it; though it survives at present in only a few copies. Add that it is found in Cod. D, and it will be seen that in all parts of ancient Christendom this portion of Scripture was familiarly known in early times.*

*“But even this is not all. Jerome, who was familiar with Greek MSS. (and who handled none of later date than B and 8), expressly relates (380) that the pericope de adultera ‘is found in many copies both Greek and Latin’...*

*“Whence is it— let me ask in passing — that go many Critics fail to see that positive testimony like the foregoing far outweighs the adverse negative testimony of 8BT, — aye, and of AC to boot if they were producible on this point? How comes it to pass that the two Codexes, 8 and B, have obtained such a mastery — rather exercise such a tyranny — over the imagination of many Critics as quite to overpower their practical judgement? We have at all events established our first proposition: viz. that from the earliest period to which testimony reaches, the incident of ‘the woman taken in adultery’ occupied its present place in St. John’s Gospel...*

Burgon then address the displacement of John 7:53-8:11 in some manuscripts to the end of Luke 21, after verse 38, which displacement White insists in most unscholarly fashion, “is plain evidence of its later origin.” See Dr Hills’s comments above under (c) **Misleading Notes in the Modern Versions**. Burgon continues.

*“It must be admitted then that as far back as testimony reaches the passage under discussion stood where it now stands in St. John’s Gospel. And this is my first position. But indeed, to be candid, hardly any one has seriously called that fact in question. No, nor do any (except Dr. Hort) doubt that the passage is also of the remotest antiquity. Adverse Critics do but insist that however ancient, it must needs be of spurious origin: or else that it is an afterthought of the Evangelist:— concerning both which imaginations we shall have a few words to offer by-and-by.*

*“It clearly follows, — indeed it may be said with truth that it only remains, — to inquire what may have led to its so frequent exclusion from the sacred Text? For really the difficulty has already resolved itself into that.*

*“And on this head, it is idle to affect perplexity. In the earliest age of all, — the age which was familiar with the universal decay of heathen virtue, but which had not yet witnessed the power of the Gospel to fashion society afresh, and to build up domestic life on a new and more enduring basis; — at a time when the greatest laxity of morals prevailed, and the enemies of the Gospel were known to be on the lookout for grounds of cavil against Christianity and its Author; — what wonder if some were found to remove the*

*pericope de adultera* from their copies, lest it should be pleaded in extenuation of breaches of the seventh commandment? The very subject-matter, I say, of *St. John viii. 3–11* would sufficiently account for the occasional omission of those nine verses. Moral considerations abundantly explain what is found to have here and there happened. But in fact this is not a mere conjecture of my own. It is the reason assigned by Augustine for the erasure of these twelve verses from many copies of the Gospel [see Augustine's remarks quoted above]. Ambrose, a quarter of a century earlier, had clearly intimated that danger was popularly apprehended from this quarter: while Nicon, five centuries later, states plainly that the mischievous tendency of the narrative was the cause why it had been expunged from the Armenian version.

“The Church in the meantime for an obvious reason had made choice of *St. John vii. 37–viii. 12* — the greater part of which is clearly descriptive of what happened at the Feast of Tabernacles — for her Pentecostal lesson: and judged it expedient, besides omitting as inappropriate to the occasion the incident of the woman taken in adultery, to ignore also the three preceding verses;— making the severance begin, in fact, as far back as the end of *ch. vii. 52*. The reason for this is plain. In this way the allusion to a certain departure at night, and return early next morning (*St. John vii. 53: viii. 1*), was avoided, which entirely marred the effect of the lection as the history of a day of great and special solemnity, — ‘the great day of the Feast.’ And thus it happens that the gospel for the day of Pentecost was made to proceed directly from ‘Search and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet,’ in *ch. vii. 52*, — to ‘Then spake Jesus unto them, saying, I am the light of the world,’ in *ch. viii. 12*; with which it ends. In other words, an omission which owed its beginning to a moral scruple was eventually extended for a liturgical consideration; and resulted in severing twelve verses of *St. John’s Gospel* — *ch. vii. 53 to viii. 11* — from their lawful context.”

Note that Burgon has here answered White’s objection to *John 7:53-8:11* on the grounds that it is missing from “the majority of lectionaries, Latin versions, and Syriac versions.” Note again Dr Moorman’s<sup>9 p 105</sup> evidence that shows that *John 7:53-8:11* is *not* missing from “the majority of...Latin versions.” 10 Old Latin sources contain the passage, against 5 that do not. “The majority of...Syriac versions” consist of 3 of the versions, including the Peshitta that omit the passage, versus 2 that contain it. White has once again misled the reader. Burgon continues.

“We may now proceed to the consideration of my second proposition, which is

“(2) That by the very construction of her Lectionary, the Church in her corporate capacity and official character has solemnly recognized the narrative in question as an integral part of *St. John’s Gospel*, and as standing in its traditional place, from an exceedingly remote time.

“Take into your hands at random the first MS. copy of *St. John’s Gospel* which presents itself, and turn to the place in question. Nay, I will instance all the four Evangelia which I call mine, — all the seventeen which belong to Lord Zouch, — all the thirty-nine which Baroness Burdett-Coutts imported from Epirus in 1870-2. Now all these copies — (and nearly each of them represents a different line of ancestry) — are found to contain the verses in question. How did the verses ever get there?...

“Some out of the Evangelia referred to are observed to have been prepared for ecclesiastical use: in other words, are so rubricated throughout as to shew where every separate lection had its ‘beginning’...and where its ‘end’.... And some of these lections are made up of disjointed portions of the Gospel. Thus, the lection for Whitsunday is found to have

*extended from St. John vii. 37 to St. John viii. 12...but over-leaping the twelve verses now under discussion: viz. vii. 53 to viii. 11. Accordingly, the word ‘over-leap’...is written in all the copies after vii. 52, — whereby the reader, having read on to the end of that verse, was directed to skip all that followed down to the words καὶ μηκέτι αμαρτάνει [“and no more sin”] in ch. viii. 11: after which he found himself instructed to “recommence’... Again I ask (and this time does not the riddle admit of only one solution?), — When and how does the reader suppose that the narrative of ‘the woman taken in adultery’ first found its way into the middle of the lesson for Pentecost? I pause for an answer: I shall perforce be told that it never ‘found its way’ into the lection at all: but having once crept into St. John’s Gospel, however that may have been effected, and established itself there, it left those ancient men who devised the Church’s Lectionary without choice. They could but direct its omission, and employ for that purpose the established liturgical formula in all similar cases.*

*But first, — How is it that those who would reject the narrative are not struck by the essential foolishness of supposing that twelve fabricated verses, purporting to be an integral part of the fourth Gospel, can have so firmly established themselves in every part of Christendom from the second century downwards, that they have long since become simply ineradicable? Did the Church then...abdicate her function of ‘being a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ’? Was she all of a sudden forsaken by the inspiring Spirit, who, as she was promised, should ‘guide her into all Truth’? And has she been all down the ages guided into the grievous error of imputing to the disciple whom Jesus loved a narrative of which he knew nothing? For, as I remarked at the outset, this is not merely an assimilated expression, or an unauthorized nominative, or a weakly-supported clause, or any such trifling thing. Although be it remarked in passing, I am not aware of a single such trifling excrescence which we are not able at once to detect and to remove. In other words, this is not at all a question, like the rest, about the genuine text of a passage. Our inquiry is of an essentially different kind, viz. Are these twelve consecutive verses Scripture at all, or not? Divine or human? Which? They claim by their very structure and contents to be an integral part of the Gospel. And such a serious accession to the Deposit, I insist, can neither have ‘crept into’ the Text, nor have ‘crept out’ of it. The thing is unexampled, — is unapproached, — is impossible.*

*“Above all, — (the reader is entreated to give the subject his sustained attention), — Is it not perceived that the admission involved in the hypothesis before us is fatal to any rational pretence that the passage is of spurious origin? We have got back in thought at least to the third or fourth century of our era. We are among the Fathers and Doctors of the Eastern Church in conference assembled: and they are determining what shall be the Gospel for the great Festival of Pentecost. ‘It shall begin’ (say they) ‘at the thirty-seventh verse of St. John vii, and conclude with the twelfth verse of St. John viii. But so much of it as relates to the breaking up of the Sanhedrin, — to the withdrawal of our Lord to the Mount of Olives, — and to His return next morning to the Temple, — had better not be read. It disturbs the unity of the narrative. So also had the incident of the woman taken in adultery better not be read. It is inappropriate to the Pentecostal Festival.’ The Authors of the great Oriental Liturgy therefore admit that they find the disputed verses in their copies: and thus they vouch for their genuineness. For none will doubt that, had they regarded them as a spurious accretion to the inspired page, they would have said so plainly. Nor can it be denied that if in their corporate capacity they had disallowed these twelve verses, such an authoritative condemnation would most certainly have resulted in the perpetual exclusion from the Sacred Text of the part of these verses which was actually adopted as a Lection. What stronger testimony on the contrary can*

*be imagined to the genuineness of any given portion of the everlasting Gospel than that it should have been canonized or recognized as part of Inspired Scripture by the collective wisdom of the Church in the third or fourth century?*

*“And no one may regard it as a suspicious circumstance that the present Pentecostal lection has been thus maimed and mutilated in respect of twelve of its verses. There is nothing at all extraordinary in the treatment which St. John vii. 37-viii. 12 has here experienced. The phenomenon is even of perpetual recurrence in the Lectionary of the East, — as will be found explained below...*

*“The testimony borne to these verses by the Lectionary of the East proves to be of the most opportune and convincing character. The careful provision made for passing by the twelve verses in dispute:— the minute directions which fence those twelve verses off on this side and on that, directions issued we may be sure by the highest Ecclesiastical authority, because recognized in every part of the ancient Church, — not only establish them effectually in their rightful place, but (what is at least of equal importance) fully explain the adverse phenomena which are ostentatiously paraded by adverse critics; and which, until the clue has been supplied, are calculated to mislead the judgement.”*

There follows Burgon’s allusions to Chrysostom and Cyril, which Dr Hills quotes in his point *(d) The Silence of the Greek Fathers Explained* above. Burgon continues, adducing a further decisive patristic witness.

*“A triumphant refutation of the proposed inference from the silence of these many Fathers is furnished by the single fact that Theophylact must also be added to their number. Theophylact, I say, ignores the pericope de adultera — passes it by, I mean, — exactly as do Chrysostom and Cyril. But will any one pretend that Theophylact, — writing in A.D. 1077, — did not know of St. John vii. 53–viii. 11? Why, in nineteen out of every twenty copies within his reach, the whole of those twelve verses must have been to be found.*

*“The proposed inference from the silence of certain of the Fathers is therefore invalid. The argument e silentio — always an insecure argument, — proves inapplicable in this particular case. When the antecedent facts have been once explained, all the subsequent phenomena become intelligible. But a more effectual and satisfactory reply to the difficulty occasioned by the general silence of the Fathers, remains to be offered...*

*“Two of the greatest Fathers (Augustine and Ambrose) actually do utter a few words; and they are to the effect that the verses are undoubtedly genuine:— ‘Be it known to all men’ (they say) ‘that this passage is genuine: but the nature of its subject-matter has at once procured its ejection from MSS., and resulted in the silence of Commentators.’ The most learned of the Fathers in addition practically endorses the passage; for Jerome not only leaves it standing in the Vulgate where he found it in the Old Latin version, but relates that it was supported by Greek as well as Latin authorities...*

Dean Burgon then describes the testimony of the Eastern Church in favour of John 7:53-8:11 to which Dr Hills alludes – see above – and comments further on the testimony of the Eastern Church.

*“A more significant circumstance it would be impossible to adduce in evidence. Any pretence to fasten a charge of spuriousness on a portion of Scripture so singled out by the Church for honour, were nothing else but monstrous. It would be in fact to raise quite a distinct issue: viz. to inquire what amount of respect is due to the Church’s authority in determining the authenticity of Scripture? I appeal not to an opinion, but to a fact: and that fact is, that though the Fathers of the Church for a very sufficient reason are very nearly silent on the subject of these twelve verses, the Church herself has spoken with a*

*voice of authority so loud that none can affect not to hear it: so plain, that it cannot possibly be misunderstood.*

*“And let me not be told that I am hereby setting up the Lectionary as the true standard of appeal for the Text of the New Testament: still less let me be suspected of charging on the collective body of the faithful whatever irregularities are discoverable in the Codexes which were employed for the public reading of Scripture. Such a suspicion could only be entertained by one who has hitherto failed to apprehend the precise point just now under consideration [like James White]. We are not examining the text of St. John vii. 53–viii. 11. We are only discussing whether those twelve verses en bloc are to be regarded as an integral part of the fourth Gospel, or as a spurious accretion to it. And that is a point on which the Church in her corporate character must needs be competent to pronounce; and in respect of which her verdict must needs be decisive. She delivered her verdict in favour of these twelve verses, remember, at a time when her copies of the Gospels were of papyrus as well as ‘old uncials’ on vellum. — Nay, before ‘old uncials’ on vellum were at least in any general use. True, that the transcribers of Lectionaries have proved themselves just as liable to error as the men who transcribed Evangelia. But then, it is incredible that those men forged the Gospel for St. Pelagia’s day: impossible, if it were a forgery, that the Church should have adopted it. And it is the significancy of the Church having adopted the pericope de adultera as the lection for October 8, which has never yet been sufficiently attended to: and which I defy the Critics to account for on any hypothesis but one: viz. that the pericope was recognized by the ancient Eastern Church as an integral part of the Gospel.”*

White never addressed, let alone answered this key observation on the part of Dean Burgon. Moreover, it never seems to have occurred to White to question why lectionaries omitted the passage – see above. Dean Burgon now elaborates on this point.

*“Now when to this has been added what is implied in the rubrical direction that a ceremonious respect should be shewn to the Festival of Pentecost by dropping the twelve verses, I submit that I have fully established my second position, viz. That by the very construction of her Lectionary the Church in her corporate capacity and official character has solemnly recognized the narrative in question, as an integral part of St. John’s Gospel, and as standing in its traditional place, from an exceedingly remote time.*

*“For, — (I entreat the candid reader’s sustained attention), — the circumstances of the present problem altogether refuse to accommodate themselves to any hypothesis of a spurious original for these verses; as I proceed to shew.”*

Burgon continues in elaboration of his third and fourth points in favour of John 7:53–8:11, as noted above, i.e. *“Thirdly, it shall be shewn that the said explanation carries with it, and implies, a weight of testimony in support of the twelve verses in dispute, which is absolutely overwhelming. — Lastly, the positive evidence in favour of these twelve verses shall be proved to outweigh largely the negative evidence, which is relied upon by those who contend for their removal.”*

*“Repair in thought to any collection of MSS. you please; suppose to the British Museum. Request to be shewn their seventy-three copies of St. John’s Gospel, and turn to the close of his seventh chapter. At that particular place you will find, in sixty-one of these copies, these twelve verses: and in thirty-five of them you will discover, after the words Προφήτης εκ τής Γαλιλαίας ουκ εγ ηγερται [“a prophet out of Galilee has not arisen”]. a rubrical note to the effect that ‘on Whitsunday, these twelve verses are to be dropped; and the reader is to go on at ch. viii. 12.’ What can be the meaning of this respectful*

*treatment of the Pericope in question? How can it ever have come to pass that it has been thus ceremoniously handled all down the ages? Surely on no possible view of the matter but one can the phenomenon just now described be accounted for? Else, will any one gravely pretend to tell me that at some indefinitely remote period, (1) These verses were fabricated: (2) Were thrust into the place they at present occupy in the sacred text: (3) Were unsuspectingly believed to be genuine by the Church; and in consequence of which they were at once passed over by her direction on Whitsunday as incongruous, and appointed by the Church to be read on October 8, as appropriate to the occasion?"*

What follows is Burgon's refutation of the notion that some passages of John's Gospel were not scripture but 'afterthoughts,' such that John 7:53-8:11 was originally an 'uninspired' addendum to John's Gospel and mistakenly moved from after John 21:25 to the place it now occupies, in the compilation of a second edition of John's Gospel. See White<sup>3 p 262</sup>. Some of the critics, even Scrivener<sup>131 p 243, 263</sup>, regarded all of John 21 as an 'uninspired afterthought' i.e. not part of John's Gospel.

Scrivener stated with respect to John 7:53-8:11, "*This celebrated paragraph...was probably not contained in the first edition of St. John's Gospel but added at the time when his last chapter was annexed to what had once been the close of his narrative, — xx. 30, 31.*" Burgon continues.

*"But further. How is it proposed to explain why one of St. John's after-thoughts should have fared so badly at the Church's hands; — another, so well [John 7:53-8:11; John 21 respectively, see below]? I find it suggested that perhaps the subject-matter may sufficiently account for all that has happened to the pericope de adultera: And so it may, no doubt. But then, once admit this, and the hypothesis under consideration becomes simply nugatory [trifling]: fails even to touch the difficulty which it professes to remove. For if men were capable of thinking scorn of these twelve verses when they found them in the 'second and improved edition of St. John's Gospel,' why may they not have been just as irreverent in respect of the same verses, when they appeared in the first edition? How is it one whit more probable that every Greek Father for a thousand years should have systematically overlooked the twelve verses in dispute when they appeared in the second edition of St. John's Gospel, than that the same Fathers should have done the same thing when they appeared in the first?"*

*"But the hypothesis is gratuitous and nugatory: for it has been invented in order to account for the phenomenon that whereas twelve verses of St. John's Gospel are found in the large majority of the later Copies, — the same verses are observed to be absent from all but one of the five oldest Codexes. But how, (I wish to be informed,) is that hypothesis supposed to square with these phenomena? It cannot be meant that the 'second edition' of St. John did not come abroad until after Codd.  $\alpha$ ABCT were written? For we know that the old Italic version (a document of the second century) contains all the three portions of narrative [John 5:3-4; 7:53-8:11; 21, see below] which are claimed for the second edition. But if this is not meant, it is plain that some further hypothesis must be invented in order to explain why certain Greek MSS. of the fourth and fifth centuries are without the verses in dispute. And this fresh hypothesis will render that under consideration (as I said) nugatory and shew that it was gratuitous.*

*"What chiefly offends me however in this extraordinary suggestion is its irreverence. It assumes that the Gospel according to St. John was composed like any ordinary modern book: capable therefore of being improved in the second edition, by recension, addition, omission, retractation, or what not. For we may not presume to limit the changes effected in a second edition. And yet the true Author of the Gospel is confessedly God the*



*Holy Ghost: and I know of no reason for supposing that His works are imperfect when they proceed forth from His Hands.*

*“The cogency of what precedes has in fact weighed so powerfully with thoughtful and learned Divines that they have felt themselves constrained, as their last resource, to cast about for some hypothesis which shall at once account for the absence of these verses from so many copies of St. John’s Gospel, and yet retain them for their rightful owner and author, — St. John. Singular to relate, the assumption which has best approved itself to their judgement has been, that there must have existed two editions of St. John’s Gospel, — the earlier edition without, the later edition with, the incident under discussion. It is I presume, in order to conciliate favour to this singular hypothesis, that it has been further proposed to regard St. John v. 3, 4 and the whole of St. John xxi, (besides St. John vii. 53-viii. 11), as after-thoughts of the Evangelist.*

*“But this is unreasonable: for nothing else but the absence of St. John vii. 53-viii. 11, from so many copies of the Gospel has constrained the Critics to regard those verses with suspicion. Whereas, on the contrary, there is not known to exist a copy in the world which omits so much as a single verse of chap. xxi. Why then are we to assume that the whole of that chapter was away from the original draft of the Gospel? Where is the evidence for so extravagant an assumption?...”*

Such evidence does not exist. Burgon therefore concludes his discussion as follows, affirming the authenticity of John 7:53-8:11.

*“Assuming, however, just for a moment the hypothesis correct for argument’s sake, viz. that in the second edition of St. John’s Gospel the history of the woman taken in adultery appeared for the first time. Invite the authors of that hypothesis to consider what follows. The discovery that five out of six of the oldest uncials extant (to reckon here the fragment T) are without the verses in question; which yet are contained in ninety-nine out of every hundred of the despised cursives:— what other inference can be drawn from such premises, but that the cursives fortified by other evidence are by far the more trustworthy witnesses of what St. John in his old age actually entrusted to the Church’s keeping?”*

That is another question that White cannot answer. See also Dr Ruckman’s<sup>18 p 133-4, 207 p 256-8</sup> summary remarks on the passage, embodying the essential points given above.

White’s next attacks are on AV1611 readings in John 9:35, 14:14. These verses have been addressed earlier. See remarks in **Chapter 5** and **Chapter 8**, which include Will Kinney’s article on John 14:14.

White now turns on Romans 8:28 where he objects to **“all things work together for good”** in AV1611 and prefers **“God causes all things to work together for good”** as in the NASV. White acknowledges that, **“the vast majority of manuscripts...read as the KJV”** and that only **“P46 A B 81 and two translations”** read with the NASV, NIV. White further acknowledges that his<sup>3 p 33</sup> **“great treasure”** **⌘** has on this occasion defected to the reading of the majority of witnesses and the AV1611. However, he then insists that, **“if one were to determine textual readings on the basis of theological “superiority,” here the Alexandrian reading...would be the “better” reading, but is absent from the KJV.”**

**“The Alexandrian reading”** would not be **“the “better” reading,”** for reasons given in this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 158</sup>. Note once again that White’s ‘superior theology’ matches that of Rome and Watchtower.

“The next “omission” is **Romans 8:28**, where “**all things work together for good**” has been altered to “in all things God works for the good”, or similar by the NIV, JB, NWT, Ne, L, T, Tr, A are absent on this occasion, demonstrating once again that scholars are not unanimous in their attacks on the AV1611.

“Given Psalm 72:18 and Proverbs 10:22, no Christian would ever need reassurance that God would neglect to do GOOD. The test of faith is whether ALL THINGS can be received as the agents for good. Nevertheless, in the Bible “**all things**” are used to encourage rejoicing IN THE LORD, Habakkuk 3:17, 18; Philippians 4:4, to strengthen faith, Psalm 112:7, 1 Peter 1:6,7, to develop character, Job 23:10, to deepen intimacy with the Lord, Job 42:5, 6, and to reveal more of one’s real self, Job 42:5, 6 again, 2 Chronicles 32:24-26,3 1. Note that in the last reference, God is not ‘working’ at all. He simply lets events take their course - for Hezekiah’s admonition. See Isaiah 39:5-8.

“Furthermore, the NIV reading implies that God may not always be able to control circumstances but must work in spite of them. This, of course is not so, Isaiah 10:5-15.”

The anti-Rome, anti-Watchtower pre-1611 Reformation bibles, Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup>, all match the theology of the AV1611 because they read as the AV1611 in Romans 8:28. Why didn’t White criticise them for their ‘inferior theology?’ Surely such an omission on his part is ‘inconsistent’ and indicative of a ‘double standard?’

White then has a brief statement about different tenses in the different Greek texts for 1 Corinthians 11:22 but he does not criticise any AV1611 reading in this verse, so no further comment is necessary.

His next attack on the AV1611 is with respect to the words “**Take, eat**” in 1 Corinthians 11:24, which White claims are the result of “*parallel influence*” and “*harmonization on the part of scribes of any period,*” who supposedly took the words from Matthew 26:26. The NIV, NASV, JB, NWT all omit the words. See **Appendix, Table A1**.

Again, White can provide no evidence that any such harmonization ever took place. The expression “**Take, eat**” occurs in Mark 14:22 exactly as it does in Matthew 26:26, in the Received Text, although Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth all delete “**eat**” from the verse<sup>62</sup> as do Nestle, the RV, DR, JR, NIV, NASV, JB, NWT.

But why does not White criticise the scribes of the Received Text for “*parallel influence*” and “*harmonization...*” with respect to Mark 14:22? Is it because the NIV, NASV at least contain part of the expression “**Take, eat**” in Mark 14:22 and it therefore appears that the Alexandrian scribes were somewhat careless in Mark 14:22 – and in turn most careless in 1 Corinthians 11:24, where they dropped the whole expression?

And why does White<sup>3 p 155ff</sup> think that where the same or similar statements occur in different parts of the scripture, the reason must be deliberately “*inserted text*” or “*parallel influence*” and “*harmonization...*” etc.?

Is that White’s explanation for 2 Samuel 22 and Psalm 18, 2 Kings 18, 19 and Isaiah 36, 37? White does not say.

Returning to the words “**Take, eat,**” Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth omit the words<sup>62</sup>. Nestle and the RV therefore each omit the words.

Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> omits “*eat*” in Mark 14:22 but the bibles of Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops<sup>138</sup> all read as the AV1611. The pre-1611 bibles *all* have “*Take, eat*” in 1 Corinthians 11:24, with only slight variation.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 124</sup> shows that 8 uncials; C third corrector, K, L, P, Ψ, 056, 0142, 0150, 0151 contain the words, along with the majority of the cursives, the Peshitta, the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible and some of the Vulgate sources. The sources that omit the words are P46, κ, B, C original, D, Dabs, F, G, 0199, few or none of the cursives, the 4 extant Old Latin copies and the remainder of the Vulgate. Only Cyprian, 200-258 AD, is listed as having referred to 1 Corinthians 11:24 and he omits the words<sup>130 p 24, 54</sup>.

Aside from the antiquity of the dissenting uncials and the one extant patristic witness, offset by the Peshitta text and that of the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible, the sources in favour of the words “*Take, eat*” heavily outweigh those against them. Moreover, the reading is vindicated by the pre-1611 bibles that God used to bring in and sustain the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation.

Such an extensive array of witnesses in favour of the words “*Take, eat*” destroys any notion of White’s unsubstantiated and unscholarly guesswork of “*parallel influence*” and “*harmonization...*”

Note that White neglects to mention that the crucial word “*broken*” is also omitted from 1 Corinthians 11:24 by the NIV, NASV, in agreement with the JB, NWT, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford<sup>62</sup>. The pre-1611 bibles all have “*broken*” in this verse, with only minor variation, except for Wycliffe, who has “*shall be betrayed for you,*” which has a similar sense.

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 82</sup> summarises the textual evidence for and against “*broken*” in 1 Corinthians 11:24 as follows, with updated references.

#### “*1 Corinthians 11:24*”

““*broken*” is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg.[f.n.], NWT, JB. The DR has “*shall be delivered*”.

“*The Lord’s body had to be BROKEN, so that His blood could be SHED for the purpose of INDIVIDUAL SALVATION, Ephesians 1:7, 2:13, Colossians 1:14, 1 Peter 1:19, 1 John 1:7.*”

“*The TBS [pamphlet] Broken For You has produced an excellent summary of the evidence for and against the AV1611 Text.*”

““*Broken*” is omitted by Aleph, B (4<sup>th</sup> century), A, C (5<sup>th</sup> century), cursives 33 (9<sup>th</sup> century), 1739 (10<sup>th</sup> century). Also omitting the word are citations by the Armenian of Zohrab, Origen (3<sup>rd</sup> century), Cyril of Alexandria, Pelagius (both 5<sup>th</sup> century) and Fulgentius (6<sup>th</sup> century).”

““*Broken*” is reinserted by correctors of Aleph and C and retained by the ‘Abschrift’ (9<sup>th</sup> century copy of D\*), G, K, P (all 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> centuries), the majority of the Byzantine manuscripts, the majority of ancient Lectionary copies and a considerable number of “independent” Byzantine cursives: 81, 88, 104, 181, 326, 330, 436, 451, 614, 629, 630, 1241, 1739 mg. (i.e. margin), 1877, 1881, 1962, 1984, 1985, 2127, 2492, 2495. “*Broken*” is also found in copies of the Peshitta and Harclean Syriac, the Old Latin (Claramontanus and Palatinus of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, Boernerianus of the 9<sup>th</sup>), in Ulfilas’ Gothic version (4<sup>th</sup> century) and in the Armenian of Uschan. The word is cited by Ambrosiaster, Basil and Chrysostom (all 4<sup>th</sup> century), Euthalius and Theodoret (both 5<sup>th</sup> century) and John of

Damascus (8<sup>th</sup> century). *The TBS states that these writers had access to manuscripts older than any now in existence...See also Hills<sup>65 p 138</sup> [who attributes the omission to "Gnostic reasons"] and Ruckman<sup>128 p 79-80</sup>.*

\*Dabs, cited occasionally in this work.

Dr Ruckman has these comment, his emphases, about the omission of **"broken"** by the modern versions in 1 Corinthians 11:24 that White overlooked. Dr Ruckman is discussing changes from the Textus Receptus that are found in Nestle

*"The Greek authority for this change was P46; [that White noted] which, UP UNTIL THIS EXAMPLE, WAS REJECTED,\* even though it was written one hundred years before Vaticanus (B). But suddenly this papyrus fragment becomes terribly important to all the new translators! You see, THIS TIME it disagrees with the AV1611, so THIS TIME, it is accepted into the imperial company of the Vatican manuscript! (No wonder Westcott and Hort had to admit that "all intelligent criticism is subjective"! There is nothing objective about the new translations..."*

\*Dr Ruckman notes that P46 has "μοι" in 1 Corinthians 9:18 or "my," as in the Textus Receptus and the AV1611 (and the NIV, NASV, NKJV), whereas Nestle has "μου," literally "of me," along with Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford<sup>62</sup>. P46, κ, A have "τα εθνη" in 1 Corinthians 10:20 or **"the Gentiles,"** as in the Textus Receptus and the AV1611. Nestle omits the words, using Vaticanus B, along with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford<sup>62</sup> only - Tregelles allows the reading.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 124</sup> gives 15 uncials; κ corrected, C third corrector, D original with variation, D second corrector, Dabs, F, G, K, L, P, Ψ, 056, 0142, 0150, 0151, 0199 as the main witnesses containing **"broken"** along with the majority of the cursives, the 3 extant Old Latin sources, the Peshitta, the texts of which, it should be remembered, are both from the second century<sup>8 p 5, 9 p 28-9, 33</sup> and pre-350 AD Gothic Bible. Some of these witnesses, e.g. κ corrected, C, D, L may be regarded as doubtful but they effectively neutralise the main witnesses that omit **"broken,"** namely P46, κ original, A, B, C original. Few or no cursives omit **"broken,"** along with part of the Vulgate sources.

The word **"broken"** in 1 Corinthians 11:24 is clearly part of scripture. Likewise the words, **"Take, eat."**

White<sup>3 p 265</sup> then disputes the inclusion of **"murders"** in Galatians 5:21, omitted by the NIV, NASV, JB, NWT. He states that, *"the deletion of the phrase is supported by P46 κ and B, together with a long list of early church Fathers. Also, the argument can be made that this passage has been "harmonized" with Romans 1:29...But on the other hand the term is included in A C D and others, and can be easily explained as an example again of... "similar endings.""*

Again, White fails completely to provide any substance for his idle speculations about 'harmonization' and *"similar endings."* Equally, therefore, *"The term...can be easily explained"* by the Spirit of God's insertion of it into **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21, to facilitate **"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"** 1 Corinthians 2:13b.

Of the early critical text editors, only Tischendorf omits the word, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford regard it as doubtful<sup>62</sup>. However, both Nestle and Westcott and Hort's RV omit **"murders."** Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has **"manslaughters,"** and Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup> and Bishops'<sup>138</sup> all have **"murders."** Clearly the pre-1611 bibles again support the AV1611.

Dr Ruckman<sup>17 p 160</sup> has this comment on Galatians 5:21 that further refutes White's speculations about the verse.

*“Nestle has omitted ‘phonoï’ (Greek for ‘murders’) from his text on the dubious authority of two corrupt manuscripts. These are the same two manuscripts that omit the ending on Mark 16 – Vaticanus and Sinaiticus [note that Zuntz, who studied P46, judged it to be a poor manuscript<sup>8 p 134</sup>. Its witness, therefore, is doubtful]. The ‘fathers’ who approve of the omission are Origen, Marcion, Jerome, and Augustine [White’s ‘long list’ is clearly not all that long].*

*“However, the King James preserves the reading of three families of manuscripts, plus the vast majority in any family – A, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, etc.”*

White has clearly withheld important evidence with respect to this verse. This evidence is overwhelmingly in support of the AV1611 reading.

White now tries to justify the deletion by the NIV, NASV, JB, NWT of the expression **“of our Lord Jesus Christ”** from Ephesians 3:14. He states, his emphasis, *“Ephesians 1:3 begins ‘Praise be to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ Seemingly the familiarity of that phrase influenced the later addition of the exact same phraseology here at 3:14. The earliest manuscripts, again, do not contain the phrase, which is limited to Western and Byzantine sources. Those who assert that the modern translations are trying to make God more ‘acceptable’ to other religions by removing the limiting phrase ‘of our Lord Jesus Christ’ have to explain the prevalence of that very same phrase...five times in the NIV New Testament, at Romans 15:6, 2 Corinthians 1:3, Ephesians 1:3, Colossians 1:3, and 1 Peter 1:3.”*

Without having the courtesy to say so, White is again attacking Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 Chapter 20</sup>, who lists Ephesians 3:14 as one of many verses in the NIV, NASV where the Lord’s name is omitted wholly or in part. Once again, White can provide no evidence to support his notion that *“Seemingly the familiarity of that phrase influenced the later addition of the exact same phraseology here at 3:14.”* He is unable to refute Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work and in cowardly fashion, he therefore resorts to innuendo.

White has also contradicted himself in the second part of his statement. He has earlier asserted that phrases in different New Testament books influenced scribes to ‘harmonize’ passages, e.g. Galatians 5:21 *“‘harmonized’”* with Romans 1:29. He now appears certain that the words *“of our Lord Jesus Christ”* should appear *“at Romans 15:6, 2 Corinthians 1:3, Ephesians 1:3, Colossians 1:3, and 1 Peter 1:3.”*

But how does White know that all five references, or at least four of them, are not the results of ‘harmonization’? White provides no answer to this obvious question. But it is clearly prompted by his bald assumption that the wording of Ephesians 1:3 prompted scribes to add to Ephesians 3:14 so that the verses matched one another.

White himself has to explain why the AV1611 contains the phrase **“of our Lord Jesus Christ”** a total of *seven* times, with additional references in 2 Corinthians 11:31 and Ephesians 3:14, whereas the NIV, NASV only contain the phrase *five* times. Is *“the work of translation”* that the NIV translators insist in their Preface *“is never wholly finished”* aiming eventually to remove *all* reference to the words **“of our Lord Jesus Christ”** in accordance with the Antichrist’s demands for a final ‘New Age Bible’?

Naturally, White does not address this question.

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 83</sup> contains a summary evaluation of Ephesians 3:14 as follows, with updated references.

**“Ephesians 3:14**

“**“of our Lord Jesus Christ”** has been omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg. [f.n.], NWT, JB. Ruckman<sup>17 p 257</sup> indicates that Aleph and B omit the phrase. J. A. Moorman<sup>9</sup> indicates that P46 is also among the few mss. which omit the phrase.”

Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> all omit **“of our Lord Jesus Christ.”**

All the pre-1611 bibles; Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> contain the phrase.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 129-130</sup> indicates that 14 uncials; 8 second corrector, D, Dabs, F, G, K, L, Ψ, 049, 056, 075, 0142, 0150, 0151 contain **“of our Lord Jesus Christ”** in Ephesians 3:14 along with the majority of the cursives, the 9 extant Old Latin copies and the Vulgate and the Peshitta Syriac. The pre-350 AD Gothic Bible contains the phrase, as Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 629</sup> also testifies. The main witnesses that omit the words are P46, 8 original, A, B, C, P and a few or none of the cursives.

Hippolytus, 170-235 AD, and Methodius, 260-312 AD<sup>130 p 27, 29, 56</sup>, also bear witness to the words **“of our Lord Jesus Christ”** in Ephesians 3:14. The dates of these Fathers bracket that of P46, 200 AD<sup>9 p 16</sup>.

The testimony of manuscript evidence in favour of the words is again overwhelming, which probably explains why White dismisses it casually as *“limited to Western and Byzantine sources.”* This is clearly not the case given the evidence of 8 second corrector and that of the Old Latin, the Peshitta and the patristic sources is earlier than or at least contemporaneous with *“the earliest manuscripts”* that *“do not contain the phrase”* i.e. the usual suspects.

Once again, White has misled the reader. The AV1611 is correct and the modern omission is wrong.

White now tries to excuse the substitution of *“him”* or similar by the NIV, NASV, DR, JR, JB, NWT for **“Christ”** in Philippians 4:13. White states that, *“This variant is one of the many passages cited in allegation that the Alexandrian text wishes to “remove” Christ...It can be argued, of course, that Christ is the antecedent of the participle ενδυναμουντι [“which strengtheneth”], and hence the NASB is referring to Christ without having to repeat the name. It is no more confusing to figure out who the one strengthening Paul is in verse 13 than it is to figure out who the “Lord” of verse 10 is. The name of Christ is not found in 8 original A B D original 133 1739, a number of Latin versions, many other early translations, and a number of early Fathers. It is found primarily in the Byzantine manuscripts.”*

White therefore admits that *“many passages”* in the Alexandrian text eliminate names and titles with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ, which it does. See remarks in **Chapter 8**. Philippians 4:13 is plainly one of those passages. It is futile for White to resort to interpretation in order to justify the alteration in the modern versions. The Alexandrian text and a handful of allies unequivocally state *“him”* not **“Christ”** and therefore this text has removed the Lord’s name from the verse, regardless of whether or not it actually *“wishes to “remove” Christ.”*

Moreover, White fails to point out that the name **“Christ”** first appears in verse 7 of Philippians 4. It is repeated (in the AV1611) in verse 13, *six verses later*. It is therefore tenuous of White to claim that, *“Christ is the antecedent of the participle”* in verse 13 and therefore *“the NASB is referring to Christ without having to repeat the name.”* Even with the term **“the Lord”** in verse 10, the absence of the Lord’s actual name in verse

could admit of an alternative New Age interpretation, as Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>14 p 311</sup> warns, citing Philippians 4:13 in the AV1611 versus the NIV, NASV as a prime example.

*“The stark décor of each New Age Self-Realization Fellowship makes the membership...focus on their ‘picture gallery,’ a line up of likenesses of Krishna, Buddha, Christ, Yogananda, their founder, and a handful of others, who, in their view, contributed equally to the religious strength of their time and nation. A framed NIV scripture plaque, with its fill-in-the-blank deity, would finish their artful façade of fraud.”*

No-one, certainly not James White, could reasonably deny that Philippians 4:13 in the NIV, NASV is open to interpretation with respect to the identity of “*him*.”

Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> all change “**Christ**” to “*him*” as do Nestle and the RV. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has “*him*” but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> all have “**Christ**” in agreement with the AV1611.

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 131</sup> indicates that 13 uncials; 8 second corrector, D second corrector, Dabs, K, L, P, Ψ, 049, 056, 075, 0142, 0150, 0151, have “**Christ**” together with F and G, with variation. The majority of the cursives (most cursives are “*the Byzantine manuscripts*”), one Old Latin source and the Peshitta Syriac have “**Christ**.” Origen, 185-254 AD and Cyril of Jerusalem, 315-386 AD<sup>130 p 24-5, 30, 56</sup> each quotes the verse with “**Christ**” but Clement of Alexandria, 150-215 AD does so with “*him*,” indicating that corrupters of the scriptures were at work early in church history.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 631</sup> cites the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible as containing “**Christ**” in Philippians 4:13.

Dr Moorman lists 8 original, A, B, D original, I, few or no cursives (White can find only 2), the remaining 4 extant Old Latin copies and the Vulgate as the main witnesses that alter “**Christ**” to “*him*.”

By inspection, the evidence indicates that the reading is an early Alexandrian corruption. Again, the weight of testimony is vastly in favour of the AV1611 reading “**Christ**.”

Dr Ruckman<sup>17 p 455-7</sup> has these comments about Philippians 4:13, his emphases, that refute White’s evasive attempt to justify the modern alteration.

*“The “highly scientific” translators of the “more accurate” editions based on “better manuscripts” simply knock Jesus Christ clean out of the verse and attribute the SOURCE of strength to an unidentified “whom” of “him”...*

*“The omission of the word “Christ” comes – as most omissions come – from the depraved faculty at that great godless sink of spiritual corruption – Alexandria, Africa.*

*“Kennedy...tells us that the King James reading is found in all three families of manuscripts – Hesychian [Egyptian, i.e. 8 second corrector], Byzantine [e.g. majority of cursives], and Western [D second corrector, Dabs] - ...Nestle deceived us when he told us that we could “infer” from the absence of “Aleph,” “D,” and “B” that they read as the text [of Nestle], for this is not true. “D” and “Aleph”[corrected] both read with the King James, but they were not listed in the critical apparatus of Nestle...because Nestle (as W & H) was a deeply prejudiced bigot when it came to the German Bible of the Reformation. He led you to believe that only the Receptus (Syrian or Byzantine family) had the reading. ALL THREE FAMILIES have the reading, plus Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Cyprian.”* Note White’s<sup>3 p 182-3, 190-1</sup> remarks earlier about James 5:16 and Nestle.

Together with that of Origen and Cyril, see above, the additional patristic evidence of Athanasius, 296-373 AD, Cyprian, 200-258 AD<sup>130 p 23-5</sup> and Chrysostom, 347-407 AD<sup>136</sup>

in favour of “**Christ**” in Philippians 4:13 heavily outweighs the single available witness of Clement against the reading. The testimony of the later Fathers shows that the church as a whole had rejected the reading “*him*” no later than the third century. Dr Ruckman continues.

*“All of the amateurs (1880-1980) have received their orders from the African church in Rome, so all say: “The best manuscripts omit ‘Christ.’” This, as always, simply means: “The forged spurious Vaticanus, in the Vatican, containing the Apocrypha as part of the Old Testament, has attacked Jesus Christ again”...*

*“The alteration if “Christ” to “in him” found in the Vatican manuscript, is a startling witness to the fact that the same scribe who changed it objected to the Deity of Christ, **for the same thing was done in 1 Timothy 3:16**...It is the same rascal [Genesis 3:1] in both places, and he is the rascal who removed Christ’s name or title from 1 Corinthians 16:22, Ephesians 3:9, Colossians 1:2, 1 Thessalonians 1:1, and Matthew 8:29.*

*“If a manuscript omits “Christ,” catalogue it with “The Yellow Submarine.””*

White’s next attacks on verses of scripture are against “**through his blood**” in Colossians 1:14, “**not seen**” in Colossians 2:18 and “**God and our Saviour Jesus Christ**” in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1. See **Chapters 3, 7, 8** for detailed comments on these verses.

James White’s<sup>3 p 271</sup> last attack on the Holy Bible is both subtle and sinister. He highlights “**sanctified**” in Jude 1 in the AV1611 and compares it with “*beloved*” in the NASV, which word is also found, with minor variation, in the NIV, DR, JR, JB, NWT.

White states that, *“This passage again demonstrates that there is no theological program being pursued by the modern versions. The differences between “sanctified” and “beloved” in this instance is the difference between the terms *ηγιασμενοις* (sanctified) and *ηγαπημενοις*. The similarity of the terms is obvious, and the fact that either term “fits” the context is obvious as well.”*

It is also “*obvious*” to a bible believer that “**Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light**” 2 Corinthians 11:14b.

What White doesn’t realize is that Jude 1 in the modern versions perfectly “*fits*” the context” of the New Age. Were it not for spiritual pride on his part, White would have clearly seen from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s<sup>14 p 1</sup> extensive work that “*The New Age movement’s expressed goal of infiltrating the evangelical church and gradually changing the bible to conform to its One World religion is evident in the current new versions.*”

The word “**sanctified**” or “**sanctify**” means to set apart, or separate, e.g. 1 Chronicles 23:13.

***“The sons of Amram; Aaron and Moses: and Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his sons for ever, to burn incense before the LORD, to minister unto him, and to bless in his name for ever.”***

Preservation of the Christian is also an aspect of sanctification in Jude 1, as revealed in that verse and also in 1 Thessalonians 5:23. (It is interesting that, as a noun, according to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, ‘preserve’ is defined as ground *set apart* for the protection of wildlife species. Sanctification could be envisaged as the Christian’s ‘preserve.’)

***“And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ”*** 1 Thessalonians 5:23.



***“Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called”*** Jude 1.

Dr Vance<sup>208 p 346-7</sup> describes how sanctification applies to the Christian with respect to salvation. His description proves that **“sanctified”** is the correct word for the context of Jude 1, with a more specific emphasis than either *“beloved”* or *“loved.”*

*“Sanctification...is positional, and speaks of our being set apart and made holy, which includes our being purified (1 Pet 1:22) and purged (2 Pet 1:9), being washed (1 Cor. 6:11) in the blood of Jesus Christ (Rev 1:5). We have been spiritually circumcised (Col 2:11), anointed (2 Cor 1:21), given the Holy Spirit (Rom 5:5; 1 Thess 4:8), and sealed by the Holy Spirit (Eph 1:13; 4:30), perfected forever (Heb 10:14).”*

Dr Vance has here given a detailed description of what it means to be **“sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ.”**

Therefore, bible versions for the New Age cannot allow professing Christians to be set apart in the Devil’s One World Religion, Revelation 13:4. See also Daniel 3 for a description of the fate that awaits dissenters (bible believers) and will be implemented supernaturally in the Great Tribulation, 2 Kings 1:9-12, Revelation 13:13-15.

It is therefore surely no accident that the Book of Jude is located immediately prior to the Book of Revelation and is itself an overview of the end times.

Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth<sup>62</sup>, Nestle and the RV all have **“beloved”** in their texts. Wycliffe<sup>46</sup> has *“loved”* but Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> all have **“sanctified”** in agreement with the AV1611.

Dr Moorman cites only one Father as quoting Jude 1, Origen<sup>130 p 60</sup>, who favours the NIV, NASV reading. On balance, although Origen often bears witness to AV1611 readings, e.g. in Philippians 4:13 above, this is not surprising.

However, Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 148</sup> shows that **“sanctified”** is found in uncials K, L, P, 049, 056, 0142, 0251 and in the majority of the cursives. The main witnesses for *“beloved”* are P72 (3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century<sup>9 p 17</sup>), Ⲙ, A, B, Ψ, some of the cursives and the Vulgate, which source probably influenced Wycliffe’s Bible.

As is typically the case with disputed texts, the witnesses against the AV1611 are few in number compared to those that favour the AV1611 including the English Reformation bibles and mainly Alexandrian, or Catholic, which is more than sufficient reason for retaining *all* AV1611 readings.

### ***In Conclusion***

This chapter concludes the detailed evaluation of White’s book. In several respects, this chapter is characteristic of White’s approach to the Holy Bible throughout his book because in sum, the chapter has shown that White has:

- Played down evidence, e.g. that of Dr Moorman, that conflicts with or refutes White’s notion of what is or is not scripture, e.g. with respect to John 7:53-8:11
- Tried to excuse omission of important words and phrases such as **“of the Lord Jesus Christ”** e.g. in Ephesians 3:14, because similar wording is found elsewhere in the New Testament, thereby condoning the gradual weakening of major biblical doctrine
- Repeatedly indulged in unsubstantiated speculation about what is or is not, or may or may not be scripture, in his opinion, e.g. with respect to Matthew 6:13, John 3:13, 1 Corinthians 11:24 etc.

- Readily resorted to subjective interpretation in order to evade textual evidence unfavourable to his opinion about what is or is not or may or may not be scripture, e.g. with respect to Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:11, Ephesians 3:14, Philippians 4:13 etc.
- Ignored the works of genuine textual scholars such as Dr Hills and Dean Burgon, because their conclusions based on exceptionally thorough, indeed exhaustive studies of textual evidence disagreed with his own opinion about what is or is not scripture, even though White had access to their works, listed some of them in his bibliography and commended<sup>3 p 91</sup> some of them, e.g. Burgon as “*true scholars of the first rank*”
- Accused bible believers of ‘inconsistency’ and ‘double standards’ but is repeatedly guilty of these failings himself. See, for example *White’s Introduction* and *Chapter 2 – “If It Ain’t Broke...”*

A final word is appropriate, from the insightful observations of Will Kinney<sup>178, 180</sup>, whose careful studies have contributed greatly to this work.

*“I am often amazed at the criticisms against the King James Bible that the modern version proponents bring up. They don’t usually discover these things for themselves but copy and paste them from some anti-KJV site, like those of Doug Kutilek or James White.*

*“They profess a great love for God’s words, yet if you ask them where we common Christians can get a copy of the infallible words of God, they soon reveal that the only “infallible bible” they have exists solely in their minds and imaginations. They don’t believe any translation can be the infallible words of God nor do they have any “Hebrew and Greek texts” that completely represent the originals. Their mystical bible is made up of their own personal opinions and preferences, and of course, their “bible” differs from the “bible” the next scholar has dreamed up for himself. Each man becomes his own final authority - “In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” Judges 21:25...*

*“James White and others like him do not believe that any single Book called the Holy Bible is actually the complete, inerrant, inspired words of God. I know this for a fact, having read his book several times and having talked with him both on the radio and the internet. All he has to recommend his readers are a variety of multiple-choice, Let’s Hope They’re Close Enuf, conflicting and contradictory “reliable versions”. But an actual paper and ink Book we can hold in our hands and believe every word of it? Nah, no such thing exists in James White’s thinking.”*

Will Kinney has effectively summed up White’s whole book.

### **Summary Tables 7-9**

These tables have been prepared to encapsulate the results of *Chapters 4, 7-9* and *Part Two*. See equivalent tables at the end of *Chapters 8, 9*. These tables mainly address the specific ‘textual differences’ to which White alludes in his Chapters 7-9 and Part Two. Specific comments follow Tables 7-9.

Table 7

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Matt. 1:25	<i>first begotten</i>	<i>first begotten</i>	<i>firstborn</i>	<i>firstborn</i>	<i>firstborn</i>
Matt. 6:13	OMIT	<i>For thine is the King- dom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</i>	<i>For thine is the King- dom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</i>	<i>For thine is the King- dom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</i>	<i>For thine is the King- dom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</i>
Matt. 8:29	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>
Matt. 15:8	OMIT	<i>draweth nigh unto me with their mouths and</i>	<i>draweth near unto me with their mouth, and</i>	<i>draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and</i>	<i>draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and</i>
Matt. 16:20	OMIT	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>
Matt. 17:20	<i>unbelief</i>	<i>unbelief</i>	<i>unbelief</i>	<i>unbelief</i>	<i>unbelief</i>
Matt. 17:21	<i>but this kind is not cast out, but by preyng and fasting</i>	<i>How be it this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting</i>	<i>Howbeit this kind goeth not out, but by prayer and fasting</i>	<i>Howbeit, this kind goeth not out, but by prayer and fasting</i>	<i>Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting</i>
Matt. 18:11	<i>For man's son came to save that thing that perished</i>	<i>Yea and the son of man is come to save that which is lost</i>	<i>For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost</i>	<i>For the son of man is come to save that which was lost</i>	<i>For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost</i>
Matt. 19:17a	<i>What askest thou Me of good thing?</i>	<i>Why callest thou me good?</i>	<i>Why callest thou me good?</i>	<i>Why callest thou me good?</i>	<i>Why callest thou me good?</i>
Matt. 19:17b	<i>God</i>	<i>that is, God</i>	<i>even God</i>	<i>[and that is] God</i>	<i>that is, God</i>
Matt. 21:12	<i>of God</i>	<i>of God</i>	<i>of God</i>	<i>of God</i>	<i>of God</i>

Table 7, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops' <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Matt. 27:35	<i>to fulfil that is said by the prophet, saying, They parted to them my clothes, and on my cloth they cast lot</i>	<i>to fulfil that was spoken by the prophet. They divided my garments among them: and upon my vesture did cast lots</i>	<i>that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the Prophet, They divided my garments among them, and upon my vesture did cast lots</i>	<i>that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet: They departed my garments among them, &amp; upon my vesture did they cast lots</i>	<i>that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots</i>
Mark 1:2	<i>Isaiah the prophet</i>	<i>the prophets</i>	<i>the prophets</i>	<i>the prophets</i>	<i>the prophets</i>
Mark 6:11	OMIT	<i>I say verily unto you it shall be easier for Sodom and Gomorrha at the day of judgment than for that city</i>	<i>Verily I say unto you, It shall be easier for Sodom, or Gomorrha at the day of judgment, than for that city</i>	<i>I say verily unto you, it shall be easier for the Sodomites and the Gomorrheans in the day of judgement, than for that city</i>	<i>Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city</i>
Mark 7:16	<i>If any man have ears of hearing, hear he</i>	<i>If any man have ears to hear let him hear</i>	<i>If any have ears to hear, let him hear</i>	<i>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear</i>	<i>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear</i>
Mark 9:44, 46	<i>where the worm of them dieth not, and the fire is not quenched</i>	<i>where their worm dieth not and the fire never goeth out</i>	<i>Where their worm dieth not, &amp; the fire never goeth out</i>	<i>Where their worm dieth not, &amp; the fire goeth not out</i>	<i>Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched</i>
Mark 10:21	OMIT	<i>take up thy cross</i>	<i>take up the cross</i>	<i>take up the cross</i>	<i>take up the cross</i>
Mark 10:24	<i>for men that trust in riches</i>	<i>for them that trust in riches</i>	<i>for them that trust in riches</i>	<i>for them<sup>note 4</sup> that trust in riches</i>	<i>for them that trust in riches</i>

Table 7, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops' <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Mark 16:9-20	<i>And Jesus rose early the first day of the week...confirmed the word with signs following</i>	<i>When Jesus was risen the morrow after the sabbath day...confirmed the word with miracles that followed</i>	<i>And when Jesus was risen again, early the first day of the week...confirmed the word with signs that followed. Amen</i>	<i>When [Jesus] was risen early, the first [day] after the Sabbath...confirming the word with signs following</i>	<i>Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week ...confirmed the word with signs following. Amen</i>
Luke 2:14	<i>men of good will</i>	<i>unto men rejoicing</i>	<i>towards men good will</i>	<i>unto men a good will</i>	<i>good will toward men</i>
Luke 9:35	<i>beloved</i>	<i>beloved</i>	<i>beloved</i>	<i>beloved</i>	<i>beloved</i>
Luke 11:2, 4	OMIT	<i>our, which art in heaven, Thy will be fulfilled even in earth as it is in heaven, But deliver us from evil</i>	<i>Our, which art in heaven, Let thy will be done, even in earth, as it is in heaven, but deliver us from evil</i>	<i>our, which art in heaven, thy will be fulfilled, even in earth also, as it is in heaven, but deliver us from evil</i>	<i>Our, which art in heaven, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth, but deliver us from evil</i>
Luke 17:36	<i>two in a field, the t'one shall be taken, and the t'other left-</i> note 3	OMIT	<i>Two shall be in the field: one shall be received, and another shall be left</i>	<i>Two [men] shall be in the field: the one shall be received, &amp; the other forsake</i>	<i>Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left</i>
Luke 23:17	<i>But he must need deliver to them one by the feast day.</i>	<i>For of necessity he must have let one loose unto them at that feast.</i>	<i>(For of necessity he must have let one loose unto them at the feast.)</i>	<i>(For of necessity he must have let one loose unto them at the feast.)</i>	<i>(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)</i>
John 3:13	<i>that is in heaven</i>	<i>which is in heaven</i>	<i>which is in heaven</i>	<i>which is in heaven</i>	<i>which is in heaven</i>

Table 7, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops' <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
John 5:4	<i>For the angel of the Lord came down certain times into the water, and the water was moved; and he that first came down into the cistern, after the moving of the water, was made whole of whatever sickness he was held</i>	<i>For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool and troubled the water. Whosoever then first after the stirring of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had</i>	<i>For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool and troubled the water. Whosoever then first after the stirring of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had</i>	<i>For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool and stirred the water. Whosoever then first after the stirring of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had</i>	<b><i>For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had</i></b>
John 6:47	<i>in me</i>	<i>on me</i>	<i>in me</i>	<i>in me</i>	<b><i>on me</i></b>
John 7:8	<b><i>not</i></b>	<i>not...yet</i>	<i>not...yet</i>	<i>not...yet</i>	<b><i>not...yet</i></b>
John 7:53-8:11	<i>And they turned again, each to his own house...go thou, and now afterward nil thou sin no more</i>	<i>And every man went unto his own house...Neither do I condemn thee. Go and sin no more</i>	<i>And every man went unto his own house...Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more</i>	<i>And every man went unto his own house...Neither do I condemn thee: Go, and sin no more</i>	<b><i>And every man went unto his own house...Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more</i></b>
John 9:35	<i>Son of God</i>	<i>Son of God</i>	<i>Son of God</i>	<i>Son of God</i>	<b><i>Son of God</i></b>
John 14:14	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<b><i>ask anything</i></b>
Acts 4:25	<b><i>by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of our father David, thy child</i></b>	<i>by the mouth of thy servant David</i>	<i>by the mouth of thy servant David</i>	<i>by the mouth of thy servant David</i>	<b><i>by the mouth of thy servant David</i></b>
Acts 16:7	<b><i>the Spirit of Jesus</i></b>	<i>the spirit</i>	<i>the Spirit</i>	<i>the spirit</i>	<b><i>the Spirit</i></b>

Table 7, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Acts 22:16	<i>his name</i>	<i>the name of the Lord</i>	<i>the name of the Lord</i>	<i>the name of the Lord</i>	<b><i>the name of the Lord</i></b>
Rom. 1:16	OMIT	<i>of Christ</i>	<i>of Christ</i>	<i>of Christ</i>	<b><i>of Christ</i></b>
Rom. 8:28	<i>all things work together into good</i>	<i>all things work for the best</i>	<i>all things work together for the best</i>	<i>all things work for the best</i>	<b><i>all things work together for good</i></b>
Rom. 8:34	<i>Christ Jesus</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<b><i>Christ</i></b>
Rom. 11:6	OMIT	<i>if it be of works then is it no more grace. For then were deserving no longer deserving</i>	<i>but if it be of works, it is no more grace: or else were work no more work</i>	<i>But if it be of works, then is it now no grace: For then work is no more work</i>	<b><i>but if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work</i></b>
Rom. 14:10	<i>Christ</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<b><i>Christ</i></b>
Rom. 15:29	OMIT	<i>of the gospel</i>	<i>of the gospel</i>	<i>of the gospel</i>	<b><i>of the gospel</i></b>
1 Cor. 10:28a	<i>to idols</i>	<i>unto idols</i>	<i>unto idols</i>	<i>unto idols</i>	<b><i>unto idols</i></b>
1 Cor. 10:28b	OMIT	<sup>note 5</sup> <i>the earth is the Lord's and all that therein is</i>	<i>(for the earth is the Lord's, and all that therein is)</i>	<i>The earth is the Lord's and all that therein is</i>	<b><i>for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof</i></b>
1 Cor. 11:24	<i>Take ye, and eat ye...shall be betrayed</i>	<i>Take ye and eat ye...broken</i>	<i>Take, eat...broken</i>	<i>Take ye [and] eat...broke</i>	<b><i>Take, eat...broken</i></b>
Gal. 5:21	<i>manslaughters</i>	<i>murders</i>	<i>murders</i>	<i>murders</i>	<b><i>murders</i></b>
Eph. 3:9	OMIT	<i>through Jesus Christ</i>	<i>by Jesus Christ</i>	<i>through Jesus Christ</i>	<b><i>by Jesus Christ</i></b>
Eph. 3:14	<i>of our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<i>of our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<i>of our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<i>of our Lord Jesus Christ</i>	<b><i>of our Lord Jesus Christ</i></b>
Phil. 4:13	<i>him</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<i>Christ</i>	<b><i>Christ</i></b>
Col. 1:14	OMIT	<i>through his blood</i>	<i>through his blood</i>	<i>through his blood</i>	<b><i>through his blood</i></b>

Table 7, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Pre-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	Wycliffe <sup>46</sup>	Tyndale <sup>47</sup>	Geneva <sup>49</sup>	Bishops' <sup>138</sup>	AV1611
Col. 2:11	<i>the body of flesh</i>	<i>the sinful body of the flesh</i>	<i>the sinful body of the flesh</i>	<i>the body of the sins of the flesh</i>	<b><i>the body of the sins of the flesh</i></b>
Col. 2:18	<i>not seen</i>	<i>never saw</i>	<i>never saw</i>	<i>not seen</i>	<b><i>not seen</i></b>
1 Tim. 1:17	OMIT	<i>wise</i>	<i>wise</i>	<i>wise</i>	<b><i>wise</i></b>
Titus 2:13	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>	<b><i>God and our Saviour</i></b>
James 5:16	<i>sins</i>	<i>faults</i>	<i>faults</i>	<i>faults</i>	<b><i>faults</i></b>
1 Peter 2:2	<i>wax into health</i>	<i>grow therein</i>	<i>grow thereby</i>	<i>grow thereby [unto salvation]</i>	<b><i>grow thereby</i></b>
2 Peter 1:1	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<b><i>God and our Saviour</i></b>
1 John 4:3	OMIT	<i>Christ is come in the flesh</i>	<i>Christ is come in the flesh</i>	<i>Christ is come in the flesh</i>	<b><i>Christ is come in the flesh</i></b>
Jude 1	<i>loved</i>	<i>sanctified</i>	<i>sanctified</i>	<i>sanctified</i>	<b><i>sanctified</i></b>
Rev. 1:11a	OMIT	<i>I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last</i>	<i>I am Alpha and Omega, that first and that last: &amp;</i>	<i>I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last</i>	<b><i>I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and</i></b>
Rev. 1:11b	<i>that are in Asia</i>	<i>which are in Asia</i>	<i>which are in Asia</i>	<i>which are in Asia</i>	<b><i>which are in Asia</i></b>
Rev. 19:1	OMIT	<i>the Lord</i>	<i>the Lord</i>	<i>the Lord</i>	<b><i>the Lord</i></b>
With AV	<b>31</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>60</b>
% with AV	<b>52</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>

## Notes:

1. Spelling is as in the AV1611 unless the wording is significantly different.
2. Readings that differ essentially from the AV1611 are shaded, likewise omissions.
3. Luke 17:36 in the AV1611 is Luke 17:35b in Wycliffe's Bible.
4. The reading "*them*" in Mark 10:24 is taken from Dr Mrs Riplinger's work<sup>39 p 660</sup>. Online versions<sup>138</sup> have "*the*," which may be a misprint.
5. The expression is retained in the printed edition of Tyndale's 1526 New Testament but is omitted from the 1525-6 online [www.studydrive.org](http://www.studydrive.org) edition.



Table 7 shows that of the 60 passages of scripture consisting of 81 individual verses where James White disputes the AV1611 readings, the 16<sup>th</sup> century bibles show very high individual levels of agreement with the AV1611, of 97-98%. Wycliffe's Bible yields agreement with the AV1611 of 52% based on the passages of scripture but 66% agreement based on the number of individual verses, with one of the two correct readings each in Matthew 19:17, 1 Corinthians 10:28 and Revelation 1:11, i.e. Wycliffe agrees with the AV1611 in 53.5 of the 81 verses listed or 66%..

Overall agreement for the pre-1611 bibles with the AV1611 for the 240 readings that Table 7 generates is 86% based on the 60 passages of scripture listed and 90% based on the 324 readings in total generated by the 81 individual verses listed. These results agree with those of Tables, 2, 4, 6. See **Chapters 8, 9**.

The results of Table 7 therefore illustrate further that as the English Reformation developed from its beginnings with Wycliffe's Bible, the texts of the English bibles rapidly converged on the Text of the AV1611. The AV1611 is clearly *God's* biblical text.

Table 8

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Post-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
Matt. 1:25	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>firstborn</i>
Matt. 6:13	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</i>
Matt. 8:29	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>Jesus</i>
Matt. 15:8	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and</i>
Matt. 16:20	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>Jesus</i>
Matt. 17:20	<i>little faith</i>	<i>littleness of your faith</i>	<i>little faith</i>	<i>little faith</i>	<i>unbelief</i>
Matt. 17:21	OMIT	<sup>note 3</sup> <i>[But this kind does not go out except by prayer and fasting.]</i>	OMIT	OMIT	<i>Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting</i>
Matt. 18:11	OMIT	<sup>note 3</sup> <i>[For the Son of Man has come to save that which was lost.]</i>	OMIT	OMIT	<i>For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost</i>
Matt. 19:17a	<i>Why do you ask me about what is good?</i>	<i>Why are you asking me about what is good?</i>	<i>Why do you ask me about what is good?*</i>	<i>Why do you ask me about what is good?</i>	<i>Why callest thou me good?</i>
Matt. 19:17b	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>that is, God</i>
Matt. 21:12	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>of God</i>

Table 8, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Post-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
Matt. 27:35	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots</i>
Mark 1:2	<i>Isaiah the prophet</i>	<i>Isaiah the prophet</i>	<i>the prophet Isaiah*</i>	<i>Isaiah the prophet</i>	<i>the prophets</i>
Mark 6:11	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city</i>
Mark 7:16	OMIT	<i>[If anyone has ears to hear, let him hear.]<sup>note 3</sup></i>	<i>If anyone has ears to hear, let him listen to this</i>	OMIT	<i>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear</i>
Mark 9:44, 46	OMIT	<i>[where THEIR WORM DOES NOT DIE AND THE FIRE IS NOT QUENCHE D]<sup>note 3</sup></i>	OMIT	OMIT	<i>Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched</i>
Mark 10:21	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>take up the cross</i>

Table 8, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Post-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
Mark 10:24	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>for them that trust in riches</i>
Mark 16:9-20	NIV inserts 'The most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20'	NASV has a footnote 'Later mss add vv 9-20'	JB has a footnote that 'Many MSS omit vv. 9-20'	NWT inserts passage in smaller type with heading Long Conclusion	<i>Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week ...confirmed the word with signs following. Amen</i>
Luke 2:14	<i>on earth peace to men on whom his favour rests</i>	<i>peace among men with whom He is pleased</i>	<i>peace to men who enjoy his favour. DR, JR men of good will</i>	<i>upon earth peace among men of good will</i>	<i>on earth peace, good will toward men</i>
Luke 9:35	<i>chosen</i>	<i>Chosen One</i>	<i>Chosen One</i>	<i>the one that has been chosen</i>	<i>beloved</i>
Luke 11:2, 4	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>Our, which art in heaven, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth, but deliver us from evil</i>
Luke 17:36	OMIT	<sup>note 3</sup> <i>[Two men will be in the field; one will be taken and the other will be left.]</i>	OMIT	OMIT	<i>Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left</i>

Table 8, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Post-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
Luke 23:17	OMIT	<sup>note 3</sup> [Now he was obliged to release to them at the feast one prisoner.]	OMIT	OMIT	<i>(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)</i>
John 3:13	OMIT	OMIT	<i>who is in heaven</i>	OMIT	<i>which is in heaven</i>
John 5:4	OMIT	<i>[for an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool and stirred up the water; whoever then first, after the stirring up of the water, stepped in was made well from whatever disease with which he was afflicted.]<sup>note 3</sup></i>	<i>for at intervals the angel of the Lord came down into the pool, and the water was disturbed, and the first person to enter the water after the disturbance was cured of any ailment he suffered from</i>	OMIT	<i>For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had</i>
John 6:47	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>on me</i>
John 7:8	<i>yet</i>	OMIT	OMIT*	<i>yet</i>	<i>not...yet</i>
John 7:53-8:11	NIV inserts 'The earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have John 7:53-8:11'	NASV has a footnote Later mss add the story of the adulterous woman, numbering it as John 7:53-8:11	The JB inserts 'The oldest MSS do not include it or place it elsewhere'	The NWT inserts the passage in smaller type	<i>And every man went unto his own house...Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more</i>

Table 8, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Post-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
John 9:35	<i>Son of Man</i>	<i>Son of Man</i>	<i>Son of Man</i>	<i>Son of Man</i>	<b><i>Son of God</i></b>
John 14:14	<i>ask me anything</i>	<i>ask Me anything</i>	<i>ask for anything</i>	<i>ask anything</i>	<b><i>ask anything</i></b>
			DR, JR <i>ask me anything</i>		
Acts 4:25	<i>by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of your servant, our father David</i>	<i>by the Holy Spirit, through the mouth of our father David</i> <i>Your servant</i>	<i>through the Holy Spirit and speaking through our ancestor David, your servant*</i>	<i>through holy spirit said by the mouth of our forefather David, your servant</i>	<b><i>by the mouth of thy servant David</i></b>
Acts 16:7	<i>the Spirit of Jesus</i>	<i>the Spirit of Jesus</i>	<i>the Spirit of Jesus*</i>	<i>the spirit of Jesus</i>	<b><i>the Spirit</i></b>
Acts 22:16	<i>his name</i>	<i>His name</i>	<i>his name*</i>	<i>his name</i>	<b><i>the name of the Lord</i></b>
Rom. 1:16	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<b><i>of Christ</i></b>
Rom. 8:28	<i>in all things God works for the good</i>	<i>God causes all things to work together for good</i>	<i>by turning everything to their good</i> <i>God cooperates</i>	<i>God makes all his works cooperate together for the good</i>	<b><i>all things work together for good</i></b>
Rom. 8:34	<i>Christ Jesus</i>	<i>Christ Jesus</i>	<i>Christ Jesus*</i>	<i>Christ Jesus</i>	<b><i>Christ</i></b>
Rom. 11:6	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<b><i>but if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work</i></b>
Rom. 14:10	<i>God's</i>	<i>of God</i>	<i>of God</i>	<i>of God</i>	<b><i>of Christ</i></b>
Rom. 15:29	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<b><i>the gospel of</i></b>
1 Cor. 10:28a	OMIT	<i>to idols</i>	OMIT	OMIT	<b><i>unto idols</i></b>

Table 8, Continued

Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Post-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
1 Cor. 10:28b	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof</i>
1 Cor. 11:24	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>Take, eat...broken</i>
Gal. 5:21	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>murders</i>
Eph. 3:9	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>by Jesus Christ</i>
Eph. 3:14	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>of our Lord Jesus Christ</i>
Phil. 4:13	<i>him</i>	<i>Him</i>	<i>the One, DR, JR him</i>	<i>him</i>	<i>Christ</i>
Col. 1:14	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>through his blood</i>
Col. 2:11	<i>the sinful nature</i>	<i>the body of the flesh</i>	<i>your body of flesh*</i>	<i>the body of the flesh</i>	<i>the body of the sins of the flesh</i>
Col. 2:18	<i>he has seen</i>	<i>he has seen</i>	<i>some vision they have had</i>	<i>he has seen</i>	<i>he hath not seen</i>
1 Tim. 1:17	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>wise</i>
Titus 2:13	<i>our great God and Savior</i>	<i>our great God and Saviour</i>	<i>our great God and saviour</i>	<i>the great God and of the Savior of us</i>	<i>the great God and our Saviour</i>
James 5:16	<i>sins</i>	<i>sins</i>	<i>sins*</i>	<i>sins</i>	<i>faults</i>
1 Peter 2:2	<i>grow up in your salvation</i>	<i>grow in respect to salvation</i>	<i>grow up to salvation, DR, JR grow unto salvation</i>	<i>grow to salvation</i>	<i>grow thereby</i>
2 Peter 1:1	<i>our God and Saviour</i>	<i>our God and Savior</i>	<i>our God and Saviour*</i>	<i>our God and the Saviour</i>	<i>God and our Saviour</i>

**Table 8, Continued****Comparison of Textual Data, AV1611 and Post-AV1611 Bibles, Chapter 7, Part Two<sup>3</sup>**

Verse	NIV	NASV	JB*	NWT	AV1611
1 John 4:3	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>Christ is come in the flesh</i>
Jude 1	<i>loved</i>	<i>beloved</i>	<i>dear to, DR, JR beloved</i>	<i>loved</i>	<i>sanctified</i>
Rev. 1:11a	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and</i>
Rev. 1:11b	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	<i>which are in Asia</i>
Rev. 19:1	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT	<i>the Lord</i>
With AV	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4/33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>60</b>
% with AV	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7/55</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes:

1. An asterisk\* indicates agreement of the DR, JR with the JB against the AV1611, although the actual wording may differ between the Catholic versions. Otherwise, the DR, JR agrees with the AV1611, except where actual different readings are shown.
2. NIV, NASV, JB, NWT readings that agree with the AV1611 are shaded.
3. The NASV inserts some AV1611 readings into its text in braces. These readings are therefore given in the NASV as in doubt with notes in the 1977 printed edition that “*Many mss do not contain this verse*” or “*Most ancient mss do not contain this verse*” etc. or “*Early mss do not contain this verse*” in the current online version. These NASV readings are therefore not considered to be in agreement with the AV1611 and are not shaded.
4. The first figure at the bottom of the JB\* column is for the JB, the second for the DR, JR.

Table 8 shows very poor agreement between the post-1611 bibles and the AV1611, corresponding to the results of Tables 3, 5, 6. See **Chapters 8, 9**. Overall agreement for the NIV, NASV, JB, NWT with the AV1611 is 3% based on the 240 readings from 60 passages and 2% based on the 324 readings from 81 individual verses.

Only the DR, JR shows an appreciable level of agreement with AV1611, in 33 passages or the equivalent of 54.5 verses; in Matthew 1:25, 8:29, 16:20, 17:20, 21, 18:11, 19:17b, 21:12, 27:35, Mark 6:11, 7:16, 9:44, 46, 10:24, 16:9-20, Luke 9:35, 17:36, 23:17, John 3:13, 5:4, 6:47, 7:53-8:11, 9:35, Romans 8:28, 14:10, 15:29, 1 Corinthians 10:28a, 11:24, Galatians 5:21, Ephesians 3:14, Colossians 1:14, 2:18, Titus 2:13, Revelation 1:11b. The agreement of the DR, JR, i.e. Challoner’s Revision of 1749-52, with the AV1611 is there-



fore 55% based on the total number of passages and 67% based on the total number of verses, results comparable with Wycliffe's Bible. See Tables 2, 4, 7.

Tables 2-8 address 'disputed' readings so that the results of the scripture comparison are unavoidably skewed according to so-called modern 'improvements.' However, the comparison of these readings shows a distinct divergence from the pure Reformation Text of the AV1611 that increases rapidly in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Table 9 gives an overall summary.









**Table 9, Continued**  
**English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy, Overall – To and From the AV1611**

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Departures	61	20	10	9	0	57	100	120/124	121	125	126	39/114
% Depart.*	<b>46</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>91/94</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>30/86</b>
% Depart.#	<b>43</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>89/92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>84/89</b>

\*132 passages in total.

#Results from Table 6, for comparison.

**Notes:**

1. Table 9 has been compiled in a manner similar to Table 6 but is a more comprehensive compilation of scripture adapted from White's book, using scriptures where he compares AV1611 readings generally unfavourably with the modern alternatives.
2. Table 9 includes 132 passages of scripture, based on 149 verses, drawn from Chapters 4, 7, 8, 9 and Part Two of White's book and upon which readings he comments in some detail, as 'disputed' passages.
3. The same 13 bibles have been used for comparison, 5 pre-1611 bibles; WY, Wycliffe, TY/C, Tyndale/Coverdale in the Old Testament, BIS, Bishops', GEN, Geneva and 7 post-1611 bibles; DR, Douay-Rheims (Challoner's Revision, 1749-1752), RV, Revised Version, JB, Jerusalem Bible, NJB, New Jerusalem Bible, NWT, New World Translation, NASV, New American Standard Version, NIV, 1984 New International Version\*, NKJ, New King James Version. \*Checked against 2011 readings via [biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/](http://biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/).
4. See [www.study-light.org/](http://www.study-light.org/) for the texts of the pre-1611 and post-1611 bibles, except for the NWT, [www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm](http://www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm), the JB, for which a printed editions has been used and the NJB, [www.catholic.org/bible/](http://www.catholic.org/bible/).
5. Table 9 brings together the results of Tables 2-5, 7, 8 with respect to agreement or disagreement of the pre and post-1611 bibles with the AV1611. See Tables 2-5, 7, 8 for the actual AV1611 readings and their pre and post-1611 equivalents. (Note that Tables 2-5, 7, 8 refer only to the passages of scriptures extracted from Chapters 7, 8, 9 and Part Two of White's book, not Chapter 4.)
6. Table 9 reinforces the trends observed in Table 6 but over a much more extensive range of scripture passages, disputed by bible critics such as James White. The pre-1611 bibles rapidly converge on the AV1611 Text as the English Protestant Bible Reformation of the 16<sup>th</sup> century advances. The post-1611 bibles diverge from the AV1611, with equivalent rapidity as the last days of the Laodicean Church Age close in on the Body of Christ, with *Rome leading the way* via the DR, JR of Challoner.
7. *Tables A1-A12* in the *Appendix* illustrate trends similar to those that Tables 6, 9 display, both for the full selection of passages of scripture that White alludes to in his various attacks on the Holy Bible and for selected passages addressing important doctrines, including the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

8. **Tables A1-A4** show that NIV, one of the most popular translations among ‘evangelicals,’ shows the same significant departure from the AV1611 that Table 9 exhibits, in the larger sample of 241 ‘disputed’ passages in White’s book, drawn from 252 verses. The NIV departs from the AV1611 with the DR, JR and/or JB and/or NWT in 215 of the 241 passages, or 89%.
9. **Tables A1-A4** show further that the NIV departs from “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21 in a total of 232 of the 241 passages, or 96%, even exceeding the departures of the JB, NWT, at 92% and 94% respectively.
10. The NIV therefore goes *beyond* Rome and Watchtower in forsaking the God-honoured AV1611 Text emerging as the crowning achievement of the English Reformation. *But Rome led the way*, enticing the evangelicals to follow, Revelation 17:1-5.
11. **Tables A5-A8** reveal the contempt that Westcott and Hort had for various fundamental aspects of Christian belief, where their RV departs from the AV1611 in no fewer than 44 of the 45 selected passages, or 98%.
12. However, the NIV yields a similar result. **Tables A5-A8** shows that it departs from the AV1611 with the RV in 40 of these 45 selected passages, or 89%.
13. Nevertheless, overall, Table 9, as **Tables A1-A4**, shows that the NIV and its Auguean stable mate, the NASV, are significantly more apostate than the RV, matching and again even surpassing the modern bibles of Rome and Watchtower in their defections from “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21, at levels of 95% departures from the AV1611 in ‘disputed’ passages, with the JB, NWT at 91% and 92% respectively, essentially in agreement with the results of **Tables A1-A4** for the wider selection of ‘disputed’ passages.
14. Table 9 shows that the NKJV is clearly part of the same Laodicean trend, with no less than 86% departures from the AV1611 in the ‘disputed’ passages, when its footnoted alternatives are taken into consideration insofar as these alternatives simply aggravate confusion about what is or is not ‘scripture’ in the mind of the reader.
15. Even without the footnoted alternatives, the NKJV’s departures from the AV1611 in the ‘disputed’ texts stand at 30%, roughly comparable with the Challoner DR, JR result of 43%. The NKJV is therefore no ally of any bible reader aiming to “*search the scriptures*” John 5:39.
16. In sum, the NIV, NASV, NKJV, JB, NWT can all be considered as suitable preparatory ‘bibles’ for the forthcoming New Age and as probable precursors for the Devil’s final ‘New Age Version,’ as so perceptibly explained by Dr Mrs Riplinger in *New Age Versions*.
17. In the light of these observations, therefore, James White, his cronies and his treatise, *The King James Only Controversy* can rightly be seen, along with the modern versions they support, as harbingers of the Devil’s ‘New Age.’

### ***Further Work***

The early part of this work utilised much of the treatise entitled *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, by Benjamin Wilkinson<sup>12</sup>. Doug Kutilek has attacked Wilkinson's work on his site [www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek\\_wilkinson\\_incred.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek_wilkinson_incred.htm). The next chapter consists of a response to Kutilek's attack. This response is not concerned with Wilkinson's adherence to Seventh Day Adventism, which Kutilek uses as an *ad hominem* attack on Wilkinson in a separate article, but with Kutilek's largely gnat-straining Matthew 23:24 criticisms of *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*.

This chapter draws heavily on Wilkinson's own response to his critics<sup>209</sup>. These critics were some of Wilkinson's fellow academics at the Washington Missionary College, Washington DC, where Wilkinson was Dean on Theology when he published his work *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* in June 1930.

Kutilek has also attacked the witness of the Old Latin Bibles to the Received Text of the AV1611, [www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek\\_waldensian.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek_waldensian.htm). This witness has frequently been cited in this work and therefore a response is merited. This response includes much of Will Kinney's study<sup>210</sup> in response to Kutilek's denigration of the Old Latin witness in favour of the AV1611 and Wilkinson's further remarks<sup>209</sup> Section III.

It should be understood that some of Wilkinson's statements from *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* that have been cited earlier in this work must necessarily be repeated in Chapters 11, 12, in order to show that Wilkinson had himself addressed many of the criticisms of his work that Kutilek raised 60 years later.



### **Chapter 11 – “Vindication of Our Authorized Bible Vindicated”**

Wilkinson, whom Kutilek accuses of gross error with respect to his study of the history of the Authorized Version, states in a work<sup>209</sup> Introduction written in response to his critics, whom he terms “*the Reviewers*” that:

*“Their document purports to be a review, not a reply. They should, therefore, have reviewed all my chapters and leading points; but they did not. Therefore, their document is not a review, it is a reply; yet not a fair, square reply; it is notably an attempt to refute such parts of my book as they consider weak; it is a defense of the Revisers, and an exaltation of the RV and a disparagement of the AV. (Authorized Version)*

*“They completely ignored many of my main lines of argument, as follows:*

1. *They failed in this document to examine, much less to justify the apostate, Romanizing, and Unitarian character of Westcott and Hort, leading English Revisers.*
2. *They likewise failed even to notice, much less to answer, the grave charges my book brought against Dr. Philip Schaff, President of both American Revision Committees, and his great Romanizing influence over American Theological colleges.*
3. *Their document, likewise, ignored and failed to meet the argument drawn from the Oxford movement which Jesuitized England, revised her Protestant prayer book and articles of faith, and created the men and measures which could produce the Revised Version.*
4. *They failed to notice or to meet the arguments drawn from the Council of Trent, which voted as its first four articles: (1) Establishing tradition; (2) Establishing the Apocryphal books; (3) Putting the Vulgate on its feet; (4) Taking the interpretation of the Bible out of the hands of the laity - all of which split the world into Protestantism and Catholicism.*
5. *They failed to meet the indisputable testimony which I brought forth from Catholic scholars, that in the Revised Version were restored the Catholic readings denounced in Reformation and post-Reformation times.*
6. *They made no attempt to handle the argument drawn from the chapter, “The Reformers Reject the Bible of the Papacy”.*
7. *They failed completely to meet, or even to notice, the tremendous argument drawn from the great struggle over the Jesuit Bible of 1582.*
8. *They paid absolutely no attention to my chapter, “Three Hundred Years of Attack on the King James Version”, which showed the monumental work done by Jesuits, higher critics, and pantheistic German scholars in undermining the Inspired bases laid by the prophets of God for His divine Word, laid so that all men could see that the miracle of preservation was as great as the miracle of inspiration. Those higher critics substituted for these bases their subtle pantheistic, Romanizing, Unitarianistic, figments of imagination under the dignified title of “critical intuition”.*”

Kutilek is guilty on all 8 charges that Wilkinson lays against his critics.

Kutilek’s article, *Wilkinson’s Incredible Errors*, is essentially reproduced below.

Kutilek begins with the *ad hominem* attack on Wilkinson as a Seventh Day Adventist but is forced to acknowledge that “*We recognize that Wilkinson’s grossly errant theology is*

*not sufficient grounds for rejecting his views on the text and translation of the Bible. And this was not our basis for casting aside his writing as unacceptable. As we shall show, not only was Wilkinson's doctrine aberrant, his "facts" and presentation of information were grossly inaccurate, distorted, imprecise, or just plain wrong. From his pen flowed a torrent of misinformation on nearly every subject he touched."*

Kutilek therefore launches into a direct attack on Wilkinson's work, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, in which he also attacks the late Dr David Otis Fuller, who edited Wilkinson's work for *Which Bible?*

Kutilek's first attack is entitled "Errors Even Fuller Couldn't Ignore." Kutilek states, with reference to *Which Bible?* as WB, "Among these errors that even Fuller couldn't ignore (and I will only give a sampling of examples) is the remark by Wilkinson,

*"The translators of the King James, moreover, had something beyond great scholarship and unusual skill. They had gone through a period of great suffering. They had offered their lives that the truths which they loved might live. (WB, p. 258).*

*"Unquestionably, Wilkinson ascribes to the KJV translators a period of suffering and persecution in connection with their translation work. Everyone familiar with the origins of the KJV knows that there is not a shred of truth in this. None of the KJV men were ever persecuted or oppressed for their work in producing the KJV. Fuller recognized this glaring misrepresentation and added a corrective footnote,..."*

Kutilek has distorted Wilkinson's remarks. Wilkinson said that the King's men "had gone through a period of great suffering" not that they had been persecuted "in connection with their translation work."

Dr Fuller's note about the English translators, e.g. Tyndale, Rogers, martyred during the 16<sup>th</sup> century notwithstanding, the King James translators had definitely "gone through a period of great suffering." Kutilek would despise Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work as much as James White does but neither of them could reasonably deny the following<sup>39 p 588, 610, 891-3</sup>, her emphases.

*"The KJV translators were born and lived their adult lives with a frightfully close view of the persecuting shadow of bloody Queen Mary I...*

*"The KJV translators were nursed by **parents** who had hidden their Bible and bodies from the torch-bearing henchmen of Queen Mary (reigned 1553-1558) and the unpredictable Henry VIII (reigned 1509-1547). [King James translator John] Bois's father William lived when, "One foot of S. Peter's [the pope's] chair [was] standing then in England"...During that era, the contrast between light and darkness was seen in the bright fire of the dark night burnings of **martyrs** during the reign of Catholic Queen Mary...*

*"King James translator, Lawrence Chaderton, born in 1537 in Lancashire, had been between 16 and 21 years of age when the burning of Bibles and martyrs was a weekly occurrence.*

*"King James translator, Thomas Holland, born in 1539 in Ludlow in Shropshire, would have been 14 to 19 years old during this holocaust.*

*"King James translation "chief overseer," Richard Bancroft, born in 1544, was 9 to 14 years of age when the fires burned in many public squares...*

*“The KJV translators, as small children, could have seen their friends’ parents go to the stake. Children were sometimes forced to watch their own parents burn or to set them on fire themselves.”*

In addition to the above three translators, Dr Mrs Riplinger notes similar experiences for eight others, from all over England; Henry Savile, John Reynolds, who petitioned the king at the Hampton Court Conference, Giles Tomson, Miles Smith, who wrote the Preface to the 1611 Bible, Lancelot Andrewes, Richard Eedes, Thomas Bilson, George Abbot. Hadrian Saravia was born in Artois, northern France. Dr Mrs Riplinger states that *“He was a teen when the Inquisition was killing Christians on the continent and Henry VIII was burning them in England. During his twenties he saw the torch carried again by Bloody Mary.”*

Kutilek then attacks Wilkinson’s comments on manuscript evidence.

*“In discussing variations among existing manuscript copies of the Greek New Testament, Wilkinson reveals his own astonishing ignorance by saying,*

*““The large number of conflicting readings which higher [sic; he means lower] critics have gathered must come from only a few manuscripts, since the overwhelming mass of manuscripts is identical.” (WB, p. 264)*

*“No one with even the smallest acquaintance with the manuscripts of the Greek New Testament would blunder so badly...In a footnote (again not identified as Fuller’s), Fuller rectifies this remark (with some slight distortion of his own):*

*““There are numerous small variations, but the great majority of the documents give support to the Traditional Text and may thus be identified with it. It would be difficult to find even two “identical” manuscripts.” (Ibid.)*

*“In fact, a number of variations are a little more substantial among these Byzantine manuscripts than Fuller lets on. D. A. Carson in The King James Version Debate, reports,*

*““It is also a fact that the closest manuscripts within a textual tradition average about six to ten variants per chapter.” (p. 68)*

*“This amounts between 1,500 and 2,500 variants in the whole New Testament between the most closely related Byzantine manuscripts, somewhat more for the less closely related ones (in this light, the 5,000 + variants of the Westcott-Hort text from the so-called “received text” are not so imposing). For Wilkinson to affirm that the “overwhelming mass of manuscripts is identical” is a gross distortion of the worst sort, giving a wholly false impression of both the relative extent of Alexandrian variants from the Byzantine text and the relative uniformity of Byzantine manuscripts. Such a mistake should warn us that Wilkinson is not adequately or accurately enough informed to be a safe guide in these matters.”*

Kutilek fails to discuss the nature of the variants in *“the overwhelming mass of manuscripts”* and he fails to include any comment from Carson to this effect. How does *“six to ten variants per chapter”* differ materially from *““numerous small variations””*? Kutilek has no answer, although he does cite a handful of passages later in his article where the Textus Receptus and *“the Byzantine Text”* differ. These passages will be addressed below.

In the meantime, the most that Kutilek can say is that “*a number of variations are a little more substantial among these Byzantine manuscripts than Fuller lets on*” i.e. at most, only “*a little more,*” not a lot more.

Wilkinson’s<sup>209</sup> Section II reply to his original critics, who were much more searching and detailed in their objections to *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* than Kutilek, is as follows.

“1. Overwhelming Testimony of MSS in Favor of Textus Receptus.”

“Nineteen out of every twenty Greek manuscripts, according to some authors, (Tregelles, *Account* p.138), ninety-five out of every one hundred, according to other authors, (Hastings *Encyclopedia*, 916) and according to still other authors, ninety-nine out of every one hundred (Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 11, 12) Greek manuscripts are in favor of the Received Text...”

“950 or more out of every 1000 Greek manuscripts will favor the Greek New Testament from which the King James Bible was translated...Dr. Hort, who was an opponent of the Received Text and who dominated the English New Testament Revision Committee, says:

““An overwhelming proportion of the text in all known cursive manuscripts except a few is, as a matter of fact, identical.” – Hort’s “Introduction”.

Why didn’t Kutilek accuse Dr Hort of blundering as badly as Wilkinson supposedly did? Why didn’t Kutilek accuse Dr Hort of “*gross distortion of the worst sort, giving a wholly false impression*” and of being “*not adequately or accurately enough informed to be a safe guide in these matters*”?

The reason is plainly that Kutilek, like White, has a double standard. Kutilek, moreover, shows that he has not studied this issue in any depth, unlike Dr Hills, as quoted in this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 118</sup>, with references updated. The remarks of ‘our critic’ shows that all bible-correctors attack the Holy Bible in the same way.

“Our critic regards as an “**insoluble problem**” the fact that “**no two mss. in the Byzantine or T.R. tradition agree perfectly.**” He therefore maintains that “**this tradition is not better off than any other**”. Dr. Hills<sup>65 p 199, 110 p 196</sup> compares “the printed Textus Receptus to the Traditional New Testament text found in the majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts.”

““These two texts are virtually identical. Kirsopp Lake and his associates (1928) demonstrated this fact...they came to the conclusion that in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Mark “the most popular text in the manuscripts of the tenth to the fourteenth century” differed from the Textus Receptus only four times. This small number of differences seems almost negligible in...that in this same chapter Aleph B and D differ from the Textus Receptus 69, 71, and 95 times respectively...in this same chapter B differs from Aleph 34 times and from D 102 times and...Aleph differs from D 100 times.””

Pickering<sup>129 p 118</sup>, who carried out a detailed study of the history of the New Testament Text – and whose work Kutilek accessed, see later, concludes “one may reasonably speak of up to 90% of the extant MSS belonging to the Majority text-type....Not only do the extant MSS present us with one text form enjoying an 80-90% majority, but the remaining 10-20% do not represent a single competing text form. The minority MSS [the basis “of the Westcott-Hort text”]” do not represent a single competing text form. The minority MSS disagrees much (or more) among themselves as they do with the majority. For any two of them to agree so closely as do P75 and B is an oddity. We are not judging, therefore, between two text forms, one representing 80% of the MSS and the other 20%. Rather, we have to judge between 80-90% and a fraction of 1%.”

Note that<sup>65 p 199, 129 p 117-118</sup> “*the Majority Text (Aland), or the Traditional Text (Burgon)*” or “*the Byzantine text*” are the same. Note further that Dr Hills<sup>8 p 109-113, 115</sup> documented numerous heretical readings in the Alexandrian text underlying “*the Westcott-Hort text*” whereas Donald Brake<sup>64 p 211</sup>, who wrote his thesis for Master of Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary on *The Doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures* concludes that “*Although there are variants within the Textus Receptus these are extremely few and often trivial, which demonstrates the highly stable character of the manuscript tradition.*”

It is clearly Kutilek and Carson, who are guilty of “*giving a wholly false impression*” with respect to the texts of “*existing manuscript copies of the Greek New Testament.*”

Kutilek’s criticisms of Wilkinson’s remarks with respect to “*higher [sic; he means lower] criticism*” will be answered below.

Kutilek now attacks Wilkinson with respect to his remarks on Codex A, Alexandrinus.

“*In writing of the Alexandrinus manuscript (a fifth century Greek manuscript copy of the Bible), Wilkinson states,*

“*“If the problems presented by the Alexandrinus Manuscript, and consequently by the Vaticanus, were so serious, why were we obligated to wait till 1881-1901 to learn of the glaring mistakes of the translators of the King James, when the manuscript arrived in 1627?” (WB, pp. 252-3)*

“*This can only mean that Wilkinson thought that the departures from the received text by these two manuscripts were unknown before 1881, when they were suddenly sprung on the world. Again, no one who has made any investigation of the subject could display such ignorance.*”

This is not what “*Wilkinson thought.*” As Wilkinson<sup>12 p 252</sup> himself states in the paragraph immediately preceding that which Kutilek has quoted from, “*We think enough has been given to show that the scholars of Europe and England, in particular, had ample opportunity to become fully acquainted by 1611 with the problems involved in the Alexandrinus Manuscript.*”

Wilkinson<sup>12 p 254-5</sup> states further.

“*The following words from Dr. Kenrick, Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, will support the conclusion that the translators of the King James knew the readings of Codices  $\alpha$  [Aleph], A, B, C, D, where they differed from the Received Text and denounced them. Bishop Kenrick published an English translation of the Catholic Bible in 1849. I quote from the preface: “Since the famous manuscripts of Rome, Alexandria, Cambridge, Paris, and Dublin, were examined...a verdict has been obtained in favor of the Vulgate. At the Reformation, the Greek text, as it then stood, was taken as a standard, in conformity to which the versions of the Reformers were generally made; whilst the Latin Vulgate was depreciated [sic], or despised, as a mere version.” In other words, the readings of these much boasted manuscripts, recently made available are those of the Vulgate. The Reformers knew of these readings and rejected them, as well as the Vulgate.*

“*Men of 1611 Had all the Material Necessary*

“*Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the translators of 1611 did not have access to the problems of the Alexandrinus, the Sinaiticus, and the Vaticanus by direct contact with these uncials. It mattered little. They had other manuscripts accessible which presented all the same problems. We are indebted for the following information to Dr. F. C. Cook, editor of the “Speaker’s Commentary,” chaplain to the Queen of England, who*

was invited to sit on the Revision Committee, but refused: “That Textus Receptus was taken in the first instance, from late cursive manuscripts; but its readings are maintained only so far as they agree with the best ancient versions, with the earliest and best Greek and Latin Fathers, and with the vast majority of uncial and cursive manuscripts.”

“It is then clear that among the great body of cursive and uncial manuscripts which the Reformers possessed, the majority agreed with the Received Text; there were a few, however, among these documents which belonged to the counterfeit family. These dissenting few presented all the problems which can be found in the Alexandrinus, the Vaticanus, and the Sinaiticus. In other words, the translators of the King James came to a diametrically opposite conclusion from that arrived at by the Revisers of 1881, although the men of 1611, as well as those of 1881, had before them the same problems and the same evidence.”

Wilkinson’s question is rhetorical. He is simply highlighting the absurdity of supposing that the ‘true’ text of scripture did not appear until the RV of 1881 and the ASV of 1901, especially when in the sentence immediately following that which Kutilek quotes, Wilkinson states, “*The Forum informs us that 250 different versions of the Bible were tried in England between 1611 and now [1930], but they all fell flat before the majesty of the King James. Were not the Alexandrinus and the Vaticanus able to aid these 250 versions, and overthrow the other Bible, resting, as the critics explain, on an insecure foundation?*”

In other words, “*the Alexandrinus and the Vaticanus*” were not able to overthrow the AV1611 because it was these documents that rested “*on an insecure foundation,*” not the King James. And any bibles that stem from these corrupt sources will themselves be insecure.

Kutilek is lying when he states that “*Wilkinson seems not to know that Alexandrinus is classified as a Byzantine manuscript in the Gospels, and generally supports the traditional text, certainly more so than the other early uncial manuscripts.*”

As Wilkinson<sup>12 p 252</sup> himself states, underlining added.

“The Catholic Encyclopaedia does not omit to tell us that *the New Testament from Acts on, in Codex A (the Alexandrinus), agrees with the Vatican Manuscript.*”

This sentence immediately precedes the very sentence that Kutilek quoted. How did he miss it, unless deliberately?

Kutilek is also lying when he refers to Codex A as “*a fifth century Greek manuscript copy of the Bible.*” It is not. It omits or is defective in many Old and New Testament passages<sup>171 p 408, 211, 212</sup> including Genesis 14:14-17, 15:1-6, 16-19, 16:6-9 or 10, Leviticus 6:19-23, 1 Samuel 12:17-14:9, Psalm 69:19-79:10 (*Wikipedia: Psalm 49:19-79:10*), Matthew 1:1-25:6, 2 Corinthians 4:13-12:6. The codex contains both Old and New Testament apocryphal books and is one of the sources for Brenton’s LXX<sup>41</sup>.

Codex A is not “*the Bible.*”

Kutilek’s next attack focuses on Wilkinson’s comments on sources.

**“Wilkinson asserts:**

““*It is an exaggerated idea, much exploited by those who are attacking the Received Text, that we of the present have greater, as well as more valuable, sources of information than had the translators of 1611.*” (WB, p. 250)

**“So patently false a remark compelled Fuller to footnote once again:**

““It is true that thousands of manuscripts have been brought to life [sic] since 1611, but it must be emphasized that the great majority of these are in substantial agreement with the Traditional Text underlying the Reformers’ Bibles and the King James Version.” (Ibid.)

“Fuller’s footnote doesn’t begin to tell the whole story. In reality, the resources available to students of the text of the Greek New Testament [which Greek New Testament?] today (and also in 1930 when Wilkinson wrote) are very many times greater in every respect than were available in 1611. The contents of only one ancient uncial manuscript were known to any substantial degree in 1611, codex D (6th century) of the Gospels and Acts, some of whose readings had been published by Stephanus in 1550; also some readings of Vaticanus were supplied to Erasmus in 1533 (though apparently unpublished) and a very limited and imperfect collection of its readings was published in 1606 (Frederick Henry Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 1861 edition, pp. 97, 88). None of the other ancient and valuable uncial manuscripts - A, Aleph, C, L, W, Theta, etc. - were available. So, too, none of the nearly 90 known papyrus manuscripts of the New Testament (and these papyri are usually the oldest copies of the Scripture portions they cover) were discovered until the late 1800’s or later. Similarly, knowledge of ancient translations has grown from very feeble or non-existent in 1611, to great knowledge today. This includes the Latin Vulgate (far more accurate editions are in print today), the Old Latin (all but wholly unknown in 1611), the five Syriac versions (only the Peshitta was in print in 1611), the Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, etc. In addition, the readings followed by the various church “fathers” were in many cases only poorly known and little attended to in 1611. Wilkinson’s error, whether due to ignorance or distortion, is monstrous.”

It is Kutilek who has not told “the whole story.” Note that he immediately deflects his criticism away from Wilkinson’s and Fuller’s essential point, which Kutilek cannot deny, namely that “the great majority of these [Greek manuscripts] are in substantial agreement with the Traditional Text underlying the Reformers’ Bibles and the King James Version.”

Kutilek also omitted Wilkinson’s clarifying comments<sup>12 p 250</sup> on the sources of information available to the King James translators.

“The Reformers themselves considered their sources of information perfect. Doctor Fulke says:

““But as for the Hebrew and Greek that now is, (it) may easily be proved to be the same that always hath been; neither is there any diversity in sentence, howsoever some copies, either through negligence of the writer, or by any other occasion, do vary from that which is commonly and most generally received in some letters, syllables, or words.”

“We cannot censure the Reformers for considering their sources of information sufficient and authentic enough to settle in their minds the infallible inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, since we have a scholar of repute to-day rating their material as high as the material of the present. Doctor Jacobus thus indicates the relative value of information available to Jerome, to the translators of the King James, and to the Revisers of 1900: “On the whole, the differences in the matter of the sources available in 390, 1590, and 1890 are not very serious.””

Kutilek is therefore himself guilty of the kind of ‘selective’ quoting that Wilkinson’s much more thorough critics resorted to in his day<sup>209 Section I</sup> and which deceit he exposed.

Contemporary sources are more extensive than those available to the King's men that are extant today – Kutilek cannot show that those extant in 1611 were not much greater – but have been unable to yield any kind of resultant bible effectively to challenge the AV1611 and as Wilkinson<sup>209</sup> Section II states, the additional sources appear to have been put to little use.

Responding first to the criticism as expressed by Kutilek that “*the resources available to students of the text of the Greek New Testament today (and also in 1930 when Wilkinson wrote) are very many times greater in every respect than were available in 1611,*” Wilkinson writes.

*“The Reviewers quote from the preface to the Parallel New Testament, to the effect that the manuscripts upon which the Greek Text of the King James version is founded were of a comparatively late date and few in number. In the light of the facts of the case neither of these points have any great bearing; because a manuscript is of a late date is no evidence that the text is of an inferior nature. In fact this is a very strange piece of information to be held in much esteem by those who seek to impress upon us the idea that there is not much difference among Bibles in general anyway. The manuscripts, as I have previously pointed out, are few in number from the fourth century to the ninth; then we begin to have thousands of them. Why should a manuscript of the ninth century, if it has been faithfully copied and is a legitimate descendant of the Apostles’ Bible, be held up to considerations of inferiority above a manuscript that was executed in the fourth century? I have previously pointed out that the Jews - and their copyists cannot be surpassed in skill - always considered a manuscript of a later date better than one of an older date.*

*“With regard to Manuscripts in 1611 being few in number, let it first be inquired what is meant by “few in number”. I have already brought before you the fact that Erasmus had access to many manuscripts in his day. Among the great body of cursives and uncial manuscripts which the Reformers had possessed, the majority agreed with the Received Text. The Reformers had access to many MSS. I quote from Putnam:*

*““Casaubon secured in 1600...appointment as Keeper of the Royal Library (at Geneva) ...the collection of Greek manuscripts said to be second only to that of the Vatican.” - Censorship of the Church of Rome, Vol. II, p. 354.”*

Wilkinson then inserts the statement of Canon Cook. See above and note Canon Cook's reference to “*the best ancient versions, with the earliest and best Greek and Latin Fathers,*” indicating that the compilers of the Received Text had access to these sources, in spite of Kutilek's apparent opinion to the contrary. Wilkinson continues with respect to the quality and extent of the resources that the King's men had. Contrary to Kutilek's opinion, they were not inferior to those available today.

*“The above quotation [from Canon Cook] will also answer the quotation (Sec. II, p.19) which says that the MSS of 1611 were “not selected on any estimate of merit.”*

*“I wish to present testimony on the value of these manuscripts from other authorities:*

*““The popular notion seems to be, that we are indebted for our knowledge of the true texts of Scripture to the existing uncials entirely; and that the essence of the secret dwells exclusively with the four or five oldest of these uncials. By consequence, it is popularly supposed that since we are possessed of such uncial copies, we could afford to dispense with the testimony of the cursives altogether. A more complete misconception of the facts of the case can hardly be imagined. For the plain truth is THAT ALL THE PHENOMENA EXHIBITED BY THE UNCIAL MANUSCRIPTS ARE reproduced by the cursive copies.” (Caps. mine). - Burgon and Miller, “The Traditional Text”, p. 202.”*



This statement answers Kutilek's notion that "*the other ancient and valuable uncial manuscripts - A, Aleph, C, L, W, Theta, etc.*" somehow added materially to the knowledge of New Testament source documents that the King James translators possessed. Wilkinson continues, with respect to the sufficiency of the manuscript evidence that the King James translators possessed and the greater 'in-depth' knowledge of manuscripts that the King's men and/or the Reformation translators possessed by comparison with modern translators – information that Kutilek overlooked.

*"The admirers of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus belong to this class who have completely misconceived the whole subject.*

*"We give a further testimony from another eminent authority:*

*"Our experience among the Greek cursives proves to us that transmission has not been careless, and they do represent a wholesome traditional text in the passages involving doctrine and so forth." – Dr. H. C. Hoskier, "Concerning the Genesis of the Versions." p.416.*

*"As to the large number of manuscripts in existence, we have every reason to believe that the Reformers were far better acquainted with MSS than later scholars. Dr. Jacobus in speaking of textual critics of 1582, says:*

*"The present writer has been struck with the critical acumen shown at that date (1582), and the grasp of the relative value of the common Greek manuscripts and the Latin version." - Dr. Jacobus, "Catholic and Protestant Bible", p. 212."*

Wilkinson now comments on how the newly discovered textual material has largely been ignored by modern revisers, who continue to confine themselves mainly to the corrupt old uncials<sup>8 p 117, 289-298</sup> and a few of the old papyri, e.g. P46, 66, 75. They make little use of the old versions and citations of the church fathers that Kutilek mentions.

*"On the other hand, if more manuscripts have been made accessible since 1611, little use has been made of what we had before and of the majority of those made available since. The Revisers systematically ignored the whole world of manuscripts and relied practically on only three or four. As Dean Burgon says, "But nineteen-twentieths of these documents, for any use which has been made of them, might just as well be still lying in the monastic libraries from which they were obtained." We feel, therefore, that a mistaken picture of the case has been presented with reference to the material at the disposition of the translators of 1611, and concerning their ability to use that material.*

*"I want my hearers to get this point for it sweeps away the whole theory of the late critics and the supporters of the method used by the Revisers and consequently the position taken by my Reviewers. The point is this: The Revisers, it is claimed, had so many more MSS to compare and consult than Erasmus and the King James translators had. But of what value were they? The Revisers like my Reviewers based the whole fabric of their vision on the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, and two or three more MSS. All others are relegated to the rear if they do not agree with B (Vaticanus) and Aleph (Sinaiticus). Hence, if they had a million MSS the poverty of the Revisers would have been just as great, for they confined themselves to the narrow limits of just their four or five manuscripts after all. All this talk about the large number of manuscripts accessible to the Revisers is of no consequence since they ignored them in their great zeal for the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. Dr. Scrivener protests in these words:*

““ A judge is not impartial if he rejects the testimony of eighty-nine out of a hundred witnesses. It is a law of evidence that the very few are to be suspected rather than the very many.” - “*Bibliotheca Sacra*”, p. 35.”

Concerning “*the other ancient and valuable uncial manuscripts - A, Aleph, C, L, W, Theta, etc.*” that Kutilek mentions, the mixed contents of A have been described above and Wilkinson has shown that the King James translators were aware of “*the problems involved in the Alexandrinus Manuscript.*” See **Chapter 3** for a summary of the deficiencies of  $\aleph$  Aleph and this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 13, 113ff, 124ff, 333-4</sup> for an outline of the poor quality of  $\aleph$ , B, C and L with its “*exceedingly vicious text*” according to Burgon that is “*chiefly remarkable for the correspondence of its readings with those of Codex B.*”

Codices A, W do little to help Kutilek in his criticism of the sources available to the King James translators, as noted in this author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 128-9</sup>, with references updated.

Dr Hills<sup>65 p 170-1</sup> states: “*Codex W is a very ancient manuscript. B. P. Grenfell regarded it as “probably fourth century”. Other scholars have dated it in the 5<sup>th</sup> century. Hence W is one of the oldest complete manuscripts of the Gospels in existence, possibly of the same age as Aleph. Moreover, W seems to have been written in Egypt, since during the first centuries of its existence, it seems to have been the property of the Monastery of the Vine-dresser, which was located near the third pyramid. If the Traditional Text had been invented at Antioch in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, how would it have found its way into Egypt and thence into Codex W so soon after? Why would the scribe of W, writing in the 4<sup>th</sup> or early 5<sup>th</sup> century, have adopted this newly fabricated text in Matthew and Luke in preference to the other texts which (according to Hort’s hypothesis) were older and more familiar to him? Thus the presence of the Traditional Text in W indicates that this text is a very ancient text and that it was known in Egypt before the 4<sup>th</sup> century.*”

“*Another witness to the early existence of the Traditional text is Codex A...which dates from the 5<sup>th</sup> century...In Acts and the Epistles Codex A agrees most closely with the Alexandrian text of the B and Aleph type, but in the Gospels it agrees generally with the Traditional Text. Thus in the Gospels Codex A testifies to the antiquity of the Traditional Text. According to Gregory (1907) and Kenyon (1937), Codex A was probably written in Egypt. If this is so, then A is another witness to the early presence of the Traditional text upon the Egyptian scene.*”

Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 20, 22</sup> shows that, where they are extant, Codex A agrees with the Traditional Text, or AV1611 against the modern text (favoured by Kutilek) in ratio almost 50:50, W in ratio 55:45 and  $\Theta$  in ratio 70:30 for the key doctrinal passages that Moorman has chosen for comparison. The result is, to use Dr Moorman’s term, “*a stand-off*” at least and hardly supportive of Kutilek’s stance against Wilkinson.

Neither do the papyri aid Kutilek’s stance. This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 129-133</sup> summarises the findings that reveal the essentially *poor* quality of these documents, together with the fact that, overall, the oldest fragments, P 45, 46, 66, 75 nevertheless support the Received or Traditional Text as much as they do  $\aleph$  and B.

Kutilek’s reference to the Gothic Bible of Bishop Ulfilas (the little wolf) does not help his case. Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 46</sup> notes that for the doctrinal passages selected, this bible supports the Traditional Text (AV1611) against the modern versions based on  $\aleph$  and B in ratio 3:1 and Dr Hills<sup>65 p 174</sup> states that ““*The type of text represented in it,*” Kenyon (1912) tells us, “*is for the most part that which is found in the majority of Greek manuscripts.*” *The fact, therefore, that Ulfilas in A.D. 350 produced a Gothic version based on the Traditional Text proves that this text must have been in existence before that date.*”

Concerning Kutilek's criticism of the King James translators supposedly sketchy knowledge of ancient versions and the Fathers (Kutilek fails to explain why contemporary editions of Jerome's Vulgate are "*far more accurate*" (according to what basis for comparison?)), further evidence exists to show that he is wrong. He fails to substantiate the statement "*the readings followed by the various church "fathers" were in many cases only poorly known and little attended to in 1611.*" Which cases, and how many? Kutilek does not answer.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39</sup> p 533-4, 537, 593 states that, her emphases, "*The libraries of Great Britain, King James I, and the translators brought a wealth of ancient and medieval Bibles from all over the world to the fingertips of the KJV translators. (No translator today has access to such authentic volumes; instead today's translators use printed 'critical editions' (e.g. Greek, Syriac, and Latin), which follow no one manuscript on earth.)*"

She lists among their sources "*the Greek writings of the early Christian preacher Chrysostom...a vast number of Greek manuscripts and translations, both English and foreign*" and "*the "old Latin versions."*"

She notes that translator "*Henry Saville...compiled and published in an eight-volume set the works of the great fourth century Greek preacher John Chrysostom*<sup>12</sup> p 19, 25 p 52. *The writings of Chrysostom allowed the KJV translators to see first hand, the true text of the earliest Greek New Testament.*"

Several others of the King's men were authorities on the writings of the church fathers<sup>12</sup> p 14, 16, 18, 19, 25 p 47, 213 p 89, 137, 143, 172. They included "*Dr. Thomas Holland, Balliol and Exeter Colleges, Oxford...Master and Regius Professor of Divinity, 1589... "so familiarly acquainted with the fathers as if himself had been one of them, and so versed in the schoolmen as if he were the seraphic doctor" ...John Harmar, M.A., New College, Oxford, Professor of Greek in 1585...well read in patristic and scholastic theology and a noted Latinist and Grecian...Dr. John Overall, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge...celebrated for the appropriateness of his quotations from the Fathers...Dr Miles Smith, Bishop of Gloucester in 1612...He had Hebrew at his fingers' ends; and he was so conversant with Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic that he made them as familiar to him as his native tongue...He went through the Greek and Latin fathers, making his annotations on them all.*"

Dr Smith<sup>26</sup> mentions several church fathers in his work *The Translators to the Reader*, including Origen, Augustine, Jerome, Cyril, Basil, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Theodorit and others. He refers to both translators and commentators in many languages that he and his fellow translators consulted – Kutilek lists no Fathers that modern translators consult.

"*Neither did we think much to consult the Translators or Commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek or Latin, no nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch; neither did we disdain to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anvil that which we had hammered: but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see.*"

Dr Smith also states that "*Ulfilas is reported...to have translated the Scriptures into the Gothic tongue*" so the King's men certainly knew of this work, contrary to Kutilek's insinuation that they did not. Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39</sup> 968-970 shows that Erasmus had access to the Gothic Bible and thus could have evaluated its text. It follows that the King James translators would have been acquainted with its readings, in that they used Erasmus's New Testament<sup>8</sup> p 26.

They also were familiar with early Anglo-Saxon bibles, as Dr Smith reveals.

*“Bede by Cistertiensis, to have turned a great part of them into Saxon: Efnard by Trithemius, to have abridged the French Psalter, as Beded had done the Hebrew, about the year 800: King Alfred by the said Cistertiensis, to have turned the Psalter into Saxon.”*

Dr Smith also refers to translations of the scriptures into many other languages, including Armenian and Scythian, the language of the region north of the Black Sea. Modern Georgia is in the same general area, on the east coast of the Black Sea.

He also states that *“There were also within a few hundred years after CHRIST, translations many into the Latin tongue: for this tongue also was very fit to convey the Law and the Gospel by, because in those times very many Countries of the West, yea of the South, East and North, spake or understood Latin, being made Provinces to the Romans,”* adding that *“the Syrian translation of the New Testament is in most learned men’s Libraries.”*

In other words, the King’s men had a far more detailed knowledge of ancient versions and the Fathers than Kutilek would have his readers believe.

Dr Smith likewise draws a clear distinction between the Old Latin versions and Jerome’s Vulgate.

*“Pope Leo the Tenth allowed Erasmus’ Translation of the New Testament, so much different from the vulgar [Jerome’s Vulgate], by his Apostolic Letter and Bull.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 962ff</sup> shows that Erasmus made several tours to *“the ‘Roman libraries,’ and the other libraries of Italy”* and states that, her emphasis, these tours *“would have exposed him to the text of the Old Itala (Latin) Bible...Since Erasmus was the world’s leading authority on Latin, he could easily read the Old Itala...”*

*“Erasmus wrote in his Preface that he consulted, not the Latin Vulgate, but [the] ancient Italic Bibles...dating back to the time of the apostles, [matching] Erasmus’ Greek New Testament and the King James Bible.”*

More will be cited in the next chapter about the Waldensian Bibles but this is sufficient to show that Erasmus was well-acquainted with the Old Latin text and therefore so would the King James translators have been. Payne<sup>25 p 77</sup> states that the King’s men knew that *“the Latin Vulgate...was suspect because it was popish.”*

However, Wilkinson<sup>12 p 212ff</sup>, in a statement that Kutilek does not disprove, declares that the Authorised Version of 1611 is of the same Text as that of the Waldensian Bible dating from the second century AD. See remarks under ***Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare.***

*“Waldensian influence, both from the Waldensian Bibles and Waldensian relationships, entered into the King James translation of 1611...The translators of 1611 had before them four Bibles which had come under Waldensian influences: the Diodati in Italian, the Olivetan in French, the Lutheran in German, and the Genevan in English. We have every reason to believe that they had access to at least six Waldensian Bibles written in the old Waldensian vernacular.”*

Dr Vance<sup>214 p 41</sup> lists, separately from Jerome’s Vulgate and in addition to *“the Italian versions of Brucioli (1530) and Diodati (1607),” “the Latin versions of Pagninus (1528), Juda (1543), Castalio (1551), Montanus (1572), and Tremellius 1579.”* These are most likely the editions that Wilkinson has referred to, no other explanation seems plausible.

This evidence, therefore, surely shows that the King's men must have been as thoroughly familiar with the Old Latin, as reflected in the Waldensian Bibles, as Erasmus was – see above.

Concerning Kutilek's remarks on the Vulgate, of which he says that "*far more accurate editions are in print today*," this author's analysis in **Chapter 8** of White's table<sup>3 p 195</sup> of the names and titles of the Lord Jesus Christ bears repetition.

The NIV omits 21 references, the 1977 NASV omits all 25 references, the current online NASV omits 23 references and the Vulgate omits 21 references. This result strongly indicates that the NIV and NASV are Catholic bibles like the Vulgate, although the NASV omits even more of the Lord's names and titles than the Vulgate and only slight adjustments have been made in the latest edition.

Note further that the Wycliffe New Testament omits 10 of the Lord's names and titles from the 23 verses in White's list, or less than half of those omitted by the NIV, NASV and the Vulgate. This result agrees with Dr Mrs Riplinger's<sup>39 p 788ff</sup> findings that Wycliffe's Bible was not based on a corrupt Latin Vulgate. The differences between the Wycliffe Bible and the AV1611 most likely resulted from changes made under duress<sup>39 p 777, 873-4</sup> in Wycliffe's text by his secretaries, John Purvey and Nicholas of Hereford<sup>8 p 21</sup> to match Jerome's Vulgate.

Jerome's Vulgate – current online version – has only 4 of the 25 references that the AV1611 has with respect to these passages that James White, Kutilek's fellow traveller, thought important enough to list in his book. Wycliffe's Bible, even after alteration by Purvey and Hereford (under duress) retains 15. Wycliffe, therefore, must have had access to sources other than Jerome's Vulgate. These can only have been the Old Latin, as Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 788</sup> explains. See remarks in **Chapter 8**. Wycliffe's Old Latin sources may not themselves have entirely escaped corruption – see Dr Ruckman's remarks<sup>33 p 98-9</sup> in **Chapter 4** – but he clearly had access to such and if he did, so did the King James translators. But this sample comparison distinctly illustrates why the King's men rejected Jerome's Vulgate.

Concerning Kutilek's unsubstantiated remark – see above – that "*far more accurate editions are in print today*" of the Latin Vulgate, Dr Vance<sup>63 p 3</sup> states that the Clementine Vulgate, published in 1592, "*remains the official Latin Bible of the Roman Catholic Church today.*" Dr Moorman concurs<sup>9 p 32</sup>. The King James translators would obviously have had access to it.

It is therefore Kutilek's error, "*whether due to ignorance or distortion*" that is "*monstrous.*"

Kutilek goes on.

**“Wilkinson states:**

*“The King James Bible was translated when England was fighting her way out from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism.” (WB, p. 180)*

*“Of course, this isn't so, as students of English history know. The Church of England was established in 1534, and all the rulers from Henry VIII (d. 1547) through James I (d. 1625) were Protestants in name (at least), except for the brief reign of Mary (1553-1558). In this period, Puritanism arose in England and Catholicism was suppressed. The departure of England from Catholicism was settled long before 1611. Fuller recognized this and softened Wilkinson's misstatement by footnoting:*

“*The KJV was the crowning fruit of a series of translations made in the Reformation period - Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthews, Geneva, and Bishops’ Bible. (Ibid.)*”

“*As students of English history know,*” Kutilek is wrong again. Note first that Dr Fuller does not in any way qualify Wilkinson’s statement.

Moreover, Kutilek has forgotten the Gunpowder Plot of November 1605, which Paine<sup>25 p 87-91</sup> describes succinctly. He has also overlooked the disastrous reign of Charles 1<sup>st</sup>, James’s wayward son.

During the reign of Charles 1, a judicial device called the Star Chamber became, for all intents and purposes, part of an Inquisition, in defiance of English Common Law. Firth states<sup>215 p 21-2</sup> “*The Privy Council assumed legislative power by its proclamations, ‘enjoining this to the people that was not enjoined by law, and prohibiting that which was not prohibited by law.’ The Star Chamber enforced the proclamations by fine and imprisonment, and punished opponents or critics with inordinate severity. There were Privy Councillors who ‘would ordinarily laugh when the word liberty of the subject was named,’ and to wise men it seemed that the very foundations of right were in danger of destruction. As Pym said, Parliaments without parliamentary liberties were but plausible ways to servitude. Juries existed but when they gave verdicts against the Crown they were fined for their contumacy [disobedience].*”

Judges and Privy Councillors alike were selected for their willingness to enforce the King’s will, which all too often amounted to sheer personal vindictiveness. In other words, these officials were, like Catholic European Court Judges of today, political appointees. Quite early in his reign, Charles revealed his openness to Catholic European influence. Churchill states<sup>216 p 145-6</sup> “*He...carried through his marriage with the French princess, Henrietta Maria. His arrival at Dover surrounded by a throng of French Papists and priests was the first serious shock to Charles’s popularity.*” With such influence so close at hand, the subsequent emergence of Charles’ inquisitorial leanings is therefore not surprising.

All this took place *after* the publication of the 1611 English Bible.

The remarks made earlier about the work of Jesuit assassins in the sudden death of Charles II bear repeating. See **Chapter 4**. “*Wylie<sup>95 p 585</sup> is unequivocal about the ongoing work of such assassins in the years following the Gun Powder Plot of 1605. With reference to the death of King Charles II on February 6<sup>th</sup>, 1684, Wylie states.*

“*“If one spoke of the king’s death he had to be careful in what terms he did so. His words were caught up by invisible auditors, and a hand was stretched out from the darkness to punish the imprudence of indiscreet remarks. A physician who gave it as his opinion that the king had been poisoned was seized with a sudden illness, the symptoms of which closely resembled those of the king, whom he followed to the grave in a few days. But at Rome it was not necessary to observe the same circumspection. The death of Charles II was there made the theme of certain orations, which eulogised it as singularly opportune, and it was delicately insinuated that his brother [the Duke of York, later James II, 1685-88] was not without some share in the merit of a deed that was destined to introduce a day of glory to the Roman Church and the realm of England.”*”

Churchill<sup>216 p 302, 304ff</sup> wrote in Chapter VII of his *History of the English Speaking Peoples, Volume II*, entitled *The Catholic King* on the short and disgraceful reign of James II, 1685-1688, i.e. 74-77 years *after* 1611 as follows.

*“James...dreamed of reconverting England to Rome under the sword of France. James was a convert to Rome. He was a bigot, and there was no sacrifice he would not make for his faith. Protestant opinion has never doubted that if he gained despotic power he would have used it for his religion in the same ruthless manner as Louis XIV. In the very year of James’s accession the King of France revoked the Edict of Nantes, and by the persecutions known as the Dragonnades quelled the last resistance of the Huguenots. James, in letters which are still preserved, approved the persecutions practised by the French monarch. The English Protestant nation would have been very foolish to trust themselves to the merciful tolerances of James II once he had obtained the absolute power he sought. They did not do so. They were quite sure, from his character, from his record, from his avowed unshakeable convictions, from the whole character of the Catholic Church at this time, that once he wielded the sword their choice would be the Mass or the stake.”*

Protestant historian Albert Close<sup>217</sup> p 147-162 documents numerous battles that England fought with Catholicism *after* the Gunpowder Plot and *after* the translation of the 1611 English Bible. His writings include *The Cause of the Great Civil War, 1642-1649*, *Archbishop Laud restores Idolatry in Church of England*, *Archbishop Laud Shockingly Mutilates Opponents*, *An Irish Army to Crush English Protestants*, *Jesuit Instructions to Destroy Church of England*, *Charles II a Secret Roman Catholic all his life*, *Great Irish Rebellion in 1641 incited by Roman Priests*.

*“The departure of England from Catholicism”* was not settled constitutionally until the accession to the throne of the Protestant King William III of Orange in 1688<sup>216</sup> Chapter VIII, after James’s abdication.

Kutilek now denounces Wilkinson’s interchangeable use of the terms Byzantine Text, Received Text and Traditional Text.

*“One general error that constantly recurs is Wilkinson’s equating the Textus Receptus/received text with the Byzantine or traditional text. He does this when he writes of “the Textus Receptus or Constantinopolitan” text (p. 194). Though in general the “textus receptus” editions of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs, published between 1516 and 1633 (and, strictly speaking, only the last of these can be properly called the Textus Receptus) agree with the Byzantine text (a. k. a. the traditional, majority, or Constantinopolitan text), yet there are numerous and substantial differences. By way of examples, the Byzantine text deletes all of the following verses or parts of verses found in all or some of the Textus Receptus editions listed above: Matthew 27:35, “that it might be fulfilled,” to the end of the verse; Luke 17:36; Acts 7:37, “him shall ye hear”; 8:37; 9:5b-6a, “it is hard...to him”; 10:6, “he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do”; 10:21, “which were sent unto him from Cornelius”; 15:34; Romans 16:25-27 (shifted to follow 14:23); Colossians 1:14, “through his blood”; I John 5:7-8, “in heaven” through “in earth”; Revelation 1:8, “the beginning and the ending”; 1:11, “which are in Asia”; etc. In fact, in over 1,000 places, the Textus Receptus does not represent the reading of the majority of surviving Greek manuscripts (Wilbur Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, 2nd edition, p. 237), and in many of these places, the texts of Westcott-Hort, Nestle, et al. do agree with the majority text. To equate the Textus Receptus with the Byzantine text is substantially off the mark and is certainly inaccurate and misleading. Accuracy and precision demand that the distinction between the textus receptus and the Byzantine text be rigorously noted and maintained. Wilkinson does not do this, as Fuller recognized. He footnotes Wilkinson’s error:*

“‘The title “Textus Receptus” was first given to the Traditional Text by Elzevir in 1633. In these chapters the name is given to the whole body of documents which preserve substantially the same kind of text.’ (WB, p. 194)

“Even Fuller himself confuses the traditional text with the Textus Receptus, as though they were the same.”

It is Kutilek who has been “certainly inaccurate and misleading.” He fails to quote what Pickering<sup>129 p 149, 237</sup> actually said about the Textus Receptus. Kutilek should incur White’s condemnation<sup>3 p 97, 121</sup> about misrepresentation of authors quoted, instead of an accolade about “fine ongoing work.”

“When all the evidence is in I believe that the Texts Receptus will be found to differ from the Original in something over a thousand places, most of them being very minor differences, whereas the critical texts will be found to differ from the Original in some six thousand places, many of them being serious differences.”

Pickering’s comment is actually a note to an opening remark in his concluding Chapter 8. Although he thought erroneously that the AV1611 and the Textus Receptus could be improved upon, he declared nevertheless.

“The distressing realization is forced upon us that the “progress” of the past hundred years [1881-1980, approximately] has been precisely in the wrong direction – our modern versions and critical texts are several times farther removed from the original than are the AV and TR! How could such a calamity have come upon us?”

It is not surprising that Kutilek did not elaborate on Pickering remarks, which essentially support those of Wilkinson and Fuller and totally contradict Kutilek’s.

Kutilek also neglected to check the evaluation of Dean Burgon<sup>13 p 269</sup>, one of the “true scholars of the first rank” according to Kutilek’s fellow traveller, James White<sup>3 p 91</sup>. Emphases are Burgon’s.

“The one great Fact...is **The Traditional Greek Text** of the New Testament. Call this Text Erasmian or Compluentsian, - the Text of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs, call it the ‘Received,’ or the **Traditional Greek Text**, or whatever other name you please [Kutilek: “the Byzantine text (a. k. a. the traditional, majority, or Constantinopolitan text”]; - the fact remains, that a Text **has** come done to us which is attested by a general consensus of ancient Copies, ancient Fathers, ancient Versions. This, at all events, is a point on which, (happily), there exists entire conformity of opinion between Dr. Hort and ourselves. Our readers cannot have yet forgotten his vital admission<sup>13 p 257-8</sup> that, - **Beyond all question the Textus Receptus is the dominant Graeco-Syrian text of A.D. 350 to A.D. 400.**

“Obtained from a variety of sources, this Text proves to be essentially **the same** in all. That it requires Revision in respect of many of its lesser details, is undeniable: but it is at least as certain that it is an excellent Text as it stands, and that the use of it will never lead critical students of Scripture seriously astray, - which is what no one will venture to predicate concerning any single Critical Edition of the N.T. which has been published since the days of Griesbach, by the disciples of Griesbach’s school.”

Dean Burgon’s evaluation, like that of Pickering, clearly contradicts and effectively refutes Kutilek’s criticism of Wilkinson at this point. Note that Burgon’s evaluation refers to “a Text...which is attested by a general consensus of ancient Copies, ancient Fathers, ancient Versions.” Kutilek’s perception of the Majority text does not but this consensus satisfactorily accounts for the so-called ‘minority’ readings in the AV1611. See below.



Kutilek is also wrong to state that “*strictly speaking, only the last of these [Elzevirs] can be properly called the Textus Receptus.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 948-9</sup> states, her emphasis, that “*critics of the KJV promote the idea that the term [Textus Receptus] was **first** used in the preface of the Elzevir Greek text of 1633.*’ In fact, the preface of the Elzevir 1633 edition does **not** use the words “Textus Receptus”; it states,

“***Textum** (text) ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus **receptum** (received)...*” meaning, ‘*Therefore you have the **text** now **received by all.***’

“*Everyone recognized this as the Greek New Testament text. It was not the product of Erasmus, Elzevir, or any “private interpretation.” Those who have widely read in the field of textual history know that the term ‘Textus Receptus’ is not a title but a generic term used to refer to texts used, or ‘received’ by most people...*

“*The term textus receptus is often used in reference to **any** vernacular edition commonly received among the people. For example, Yale University Press tells us, “Daniel Bomberg...produced the first printed Rabbinic Bible...[H]is second edition of 1524-25...prepared by Jacob ben Chayyim...became the **textus receptus**, the standard form of the Masoretic text...”*”

Kutilek has misled his readers by neglecting to mention that what he calls “*the Byzantine text*” and “*the majority text*” is actually the Hodges-Farstad edition, based on von Soden’s compilation (and Hoskier’s in Revelation), which collates only about 8% of the available Greek sources. As Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 8ff</sup> states in his extensive discussion of von Soden’s work, “*How can Hodges and Farstad reconstruct the God-honoured Textus Receptus on the claim of majority MS support when neither they nor von Soden or anyone else has even begun to collate the majority of MSS?*” Moorman also points out that von Soden “*was strongly Alexandrian*” and that he largely devoted his efforts to finding samples among “*the great mass of Byzantine MSS...where there is departure from the TR.*” See remarks in **Chapter 3**.

Moorman warns further that, his emphasis, “*the Majority Text Edition [to which Kutilek refers] does not take into consideration the 2,143 lectionary MSS (40% of the total Greek MSS), nor the vast field of Patristic and Versional evidence. Thus it is only with the greatest exaggeration that Hodges and Farstad can claim to revise the Received Text on the basis of a **majority** of MSS!*”

Moorman’s conclusion and Burgon’s – see above – are important with respect to the readings and verses from the Received Text that Kutilek insists “*the Byzantine text deletes.*” Dr Moorman shows that it is the artificial Hodges-Farstad text that omits these readings. Moorman<sup>11 p 27-9</sup> adds that, his emphasis, “*there are a number of readings [Moorman lists 375 of what he terms the ““most vulnerable”” readings in the New Testament] which on the basis of **current information** do seem to have a minority of MS support. In the following pages we will show that there is nevertheless quite substantial support for these passages.*” Von Soden did note the manuscripts in which these ““most vulnerable”” readings occurred and Moorman has largely used these data.

The evidence bearing witness to several of these readings has been addressed earlier. See **Chapter 7** for Matthew 27:35, Colossians 1:14, Revelation 1:11, **Chapters 4, 7** for Luke 17:36, **Chapter 4** for Acts 8:37, 9:5b-6, 1 John 5:7-8, Revelation 1:8.

This author’s earlier work<sup>8 p 78</sup> summarises the manuscript evidence for Acts 15:34, with updated references. Note that it *does* have support from “*the Byzantine text.*”

**“Acts 15:34**

“**“Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still”** has been omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV marg. [f.n.], NWT, JB.

“Ruckman<sup>88 p 442</sup> states that Aleph and B omit the verse. It is found in the Syriac and Byzantine manuscripts, in D (Western family), in C (Alexandrian family) and in the Old Latin.”

Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth<sup>62</sup> omit the verse but Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> – representing the transmission of the Traditional Text from apostolic times to the English Reformation – contain the verse, although Wycliffe adds “*and Judas went alone to Jerusalem.*”

Concerning Acts 7:37, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford<sup>62</sup> omit “**him shall ye hear**” as does Nestle and the RV. However, the bibles of the English Reformation; Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup> all contain the phrase. Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 113</sup> indicates that the majority of manuscripts (Aland’s<sup>9 p 26</sup>) omit the phrase along with P45, Ɑ, A, B, H, P Ψ and a significant minority of the extant Vulgate sources. C, D, E, P74, 049, 056, 0142, 2 Old Latin sources, one with variation, the remainder of the extant Vulgate and the Peshitta Syriac contain the phrase. The existence of the phrase in the Old Latin and the Peshitta indicates that it has ancient testimony.

Concerning Acts 10:6, 21, Romans 16:25-27, Moorman<sup>11 p 60-2</sup> notes that the AV1611 readings of Acts 10:6, 21 “**he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do**” and “**which were sent unto him from Cornelius**” respectively are found in the Reformation bibles of Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’. The AV1611 reading for Acts 10:6 is in 5 cursives, though considerably expanded in 4 and in the margin of a 6<sup>th</sup>. It is said to exist in “*others*,” as does the AV1611 reading in Acts 10:21, found also in uncial H, 69, 2495 and an Old Latin source.

Kutilek is therefore not displaying great “*Accuracy and precision*” in insisting these readings are not in “*the Byzantine text.*” They at least have representatives in “*the Byzantine text.*”

Romans 16:25-27 as found in the AV1611 occurs in the same place in the bibles of Wycliffe<sup>46</sup>, Tyndale<sup>47</sup>, Geneva<sup>49</sup>, Bishops<sup>138</sup>. Dr Moorman<sup>11 p 67</sup> notes that P61, uncials Ɑ, B, C, D, Dabs, 16 cursives and “*others*” support this location, so it is misleading for Kutilek to maintain that “*the Byzantine text*” shifts these verses. They have representatives in “*the Byzantine text*” that do not. 9 Old Latin sources, the Peshitta and 3 Fathers, Clement, 215 AD, Origen 254 AD, Ambrosiaster 354 AD, also support the AV1611 location for Romans 16:25-27.

Dr Moorman states that “*Thus there is strong support for...the doxology being placed at the end of the Epistle. How could it be anywhere else?...Origen, in his commentary on the Epistle claimed that confusion in the Greek mss. can be traced to the influential heretic, Marcion, who removed chapters 15 and 16 from his edition of Romans. The God-given sequence was retained in the Latin West.*”

As Dean Burgon affirmed, “*the fact remains, that a Text has come down to us which is attested by a general consensus of ancient Copies, ancient Fathers, ancient Versions.*” The witnesses to this text are as outlined above. They are not limited to the imperfect edition of Farstad and Hodges, based on the incomplete and unbalanced collation of von Soden.

Kutilek then attacks Wilkinson's evaluation of the ancient manuscripts. This section is lengthy and will therefore be answered in stages.

Kutilek:

***“Errors Regarding Ancient Manuscripts***

*“In a work devoted to a discussion of the text of the New Testament, the analysis of ancient manuscripts should display particular care and attention, but such is not the case with Wilkinson. He makes the amazing statement:*

*““...the scholars of Europe and England, in particular had ample opportunity to become fully acquainted by 1611 with the problems involved in the Alexandrinus manuscript.” (WB. p. 252)*

*“and in the very next paragraph, notes that this manuscript arrived (in England) from the Middle East in 1627! (pp. 252-3).”*

Kutilek fails to see his own inconsistency with respect to this criticism. He overlooked Wilkinson's statement<sup>12 p 251</sup> on the previous page.

*“The Alexandrinus Manuscript arrived in London in 1627, we are informed, just sixteen years too late for use by the translators of the King James. We would humbly inquire if a manuscript must dwell in the home town of scholars in order for them to have the use of its information? If so, then the Revisers of 1881 and 1901 were in a bad way\*.”*

\*Codex B has been in the Vatican Library since at least 1481 and Codex ̈ was first held by the Tsarist regime of Russia, after receiving it from Tischendorf and then by the Soviets, who sold it to the British Museum in 1933<sup>136</sup>.

Wilkinson notes that Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Alexandria, “*carried on an active correspondence with...Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury*” from the year 1602 and with many other European Protestants. George Abbot, it should be remembered, was one of the King James translators. He would have had ample opportunity to learn of the contents of Codex A from Cyril Lucar.

Kutilek

*“In addressing the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus manuscripts, [Wilkinson] again throws caution to the wind and claims,*

*““The case with the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus is no better. The problems presented by these two manuscripts were well known, not only to the translators of the King James, but also to Erasmus. We are told that the Old Testament portion of the Vaticanus has been printed since 1587.” (WB, p. 253)*

*“A lot of good an Old Testament manuscript will do in producing a printed edition of the New Testament, to say nothing of the fact that Erasmus had been dead for 51 years by 1587! Of course, the Sinaiticus manuscript, first discovered in 1844 and first published in 1859, could not have possibly been known in any way at all to Erasmus or the KJV translators. This is allegedly the work of “a scholar of the first rank with a thorough knowledge of the subjects about which he wrote,” to quote Fuller's characterization of Wilkinson (WB, p. 174)!”*

Kutilek has misunderstood Wilkinson's statement, which refers to “*The problems presented by these two manuscripts,*” not the manuscripts themselves. As Wilkinson<sup>12 p 255</sup>,  
<sup>209 Section II</sup> himself states – see above.

*“It is then clear that among the great body of cursive and uncial manuscripts which the Reformers possessed, the majority agreed with the Received Text; there were a few, however, among these documents which belonged to the counterfeit family. These dissenting few presented all the problems which can be found in the Alexandrinus, the Vaticanus, and the Sinaiticus.*

*““The popular notion seems to be, that we are indebted for our knowledge of the true texts of Scripture to the existing uncials entirely; and that the essence of the secret dwells exclusively with the four or five oldest of these uncials. By consequence, it is popularly supposed that since we are possessed of such uncial copies, we could afford to dispense with the testimony of the cursives altogether. A more complete misconception of the facts of the case can hardly be imagined. For the plain truth is THAT ALL THE PHENOMENA EXHIBITED BY THE UNCIAL MANUSCRIPTS ARE reproduced by the cursive copies.” (Caps. mine). - Burgon and Miller, “The Traditional Text”, p. 202.”*

The King James translators – and Erasmus – had yet another source that encapsulated these phenomena, with references updated<sup>8 p 146</sup>. (Note that although ꝛ and B repeatedly conflict with each other<sup>8 p 117-120</sup>, they also repeatedly join together in departing from the AV1611 Text, usually by omission, as Dr Moorman’s<sup>9</sup> work shows.)

*“Dr. Ruckman<sup>33 p 120, 124</sup>, states: “The AV translators were acquainted with every textual problem anyone was acquainted with on the ASV committee of 1901 or the NASV committee of 1960...The AV translators had the VATICANUS and SINAITICUS readings ON THE TABLES IN 1604 WHEN THEY SAT DOWN.”*

*“As Dr. Ruckman points out, the AV1611 translators had the Latin Vulgate and the Douay-Rheims bible among their sources.*

*“Grady says<sup>98 p 112</sup>:*

*““At this juncture, it would behove us to address the Nicolaitane fallacy that the King James translators were deprived of the Aleph and B readings. Beale writes:*

*“““Since the publication of the King James Version in 1611, numerous manuscript discoveries have contributed to a vastly increased knowledge of the original Scripture”<sup>100</sup>.*

*““The hypocrisy of (this statement) is unbelievable when one realizes that these same readings of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were very much before the scholars of the 1611 Authorised Version as represented IN THE LATIN VULGATE\*.””*

\*This would most likely have been the Clementine Edition of 1592, although the King James translators may have had the 1590 Sixtine Edition as well, named after the then Pope Sixtus V. Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 32</sup> – see above – notes that the Sixtine Vulgate “seems to move surprisingly in the direction of the Traditional Text. Sixtus died on 27 August [1590], and by 5 September all sales were stopped and the copies bought up and destroyed.” The Clementine Vulgate, named after the next Pope, Clement VIII, replaced the Sixtine Edition and “differed from the Sixtine in about 3000 places.” On the whole, it would appear that the King James translators had sufficient resources, with the Jesuit-Rheims Version of the time, the Vulgate editions of Jerome available to them and such cursives, relatively few in number but also available to the 1611 translators, that exhibited the corruptions of the yet-to-be-discovered uncials such as ꝛ and B, to avoid all the omissions and erroneous readings that later, modern editors have since blundered into.

Kutilek misconstrues Wilkinson’s allusion to the printed Old Testament portion of Vaticanus. The 1587 publication would have provided further evidence for the Reformed translators and the King James translators that Jerome’s corrupt Latin Vulgate<sup>25 p 77</sup> and

the LXX<sup>214 p 41, 218</sup>, to which they – and Erasmus - had access, were based on corrupted Greek sources. It would have strongly suggested to them, therefore, that the New Testament portion of Vaticanus also matched the Vulgate (or the Jesuit Rheims New Testament of 1582). Observe that further confirmation for the New Testament from Acts onwards would have emerged from the correspondence between Cyril Lucar and George Abbot about Codex Alexandrinus. Any Codex A readings from Acts onwards that Lucar forwarded to Abbot could then have been checked against Jerome's Vulgate and found to match. A compilation of the (then unseen) Greek basis for the Catholic bibles in Latin and English would clearly have emerged before or during the preparation of the 1611 English Bible, augmented as necessary by transcripts that Erasmus acquired –see below for the response to Kutilek's criticism of Erasmus in this respect.

Rome had a further reason for publishing the Vaticanus Old Testament in 1587, which Kutilek overlooked but which Wilkinson<sup>209 Section V</sup> explains. First set of underlinings have been added.

*“Another quotation, from Tregelles, will sustain my contention that it was the anxious desire of the Council of Trent to use the Vulgate as its great battle weapon against Protestantism, which sent the Catholic Church hurrying to the Vatican MS for refuge and for a foundation. Note that this was in the year 1578, or a quarter of a century before the AV appeared. In fact it was because the Council of Trent chose and printed and circulated in 1586 the Old Testament portion of the Vatican MS that Dr. Tregelles was convinced that he should choose the Vatican MS as his model for the New Testament. Notice that Dr. Tregelles was a model for Westcott and Hort, and that he was a member of the New Testament Revision Committee, but he in turn received his light, his lead from the Council of Trent. Tregelles says:*

*““About seventy years after this first (i.e. the Aldine Edition) appeared, the Roman edition of the LXX was published (1586), based on the Codex Vaticanus; how was it that the Roman text obtained such a currency as to displace the Aldine, and to maintain its stand in public estimation for more than two centuries and a half? How should Protestants have been willing to concede such an honour to this text which appeared under Papal sanction? It gained its ground and kept it because it was really an ancient text, such in its general complexion as was read by the early fathers. The Roman editors shrewdly guessed the antiquity of their MS from the form of the letters, etc., and that too in an age when Palaeography was but little known; they inferred the character of its text, partly from its age, partly from its accordance with early citations; and thus, even though they departed at times inadvertently from their MS they gave a text vastly superior to that of the New Testament in common use from the days of Erasmus.” “Account of Printed Text”, p. 185.”*

Rome used the publication of the Vaticanus Old Testament to whet the appetite of apostate Protestant Greek text editors (like Tregelles) for the Vaticanus New Testament and to give the Vulgate ‘respectability’ in the minds of gullible Protestants. Others, like Scrivener, were not so gullible, as Wilkinson explains.

*“Now we see where the great importance of the action of the Council of Trent leads us. It declared that Jerome's Vulgate to be properly grounded upon a substantial Greek Manuscript must rely upon the Vaticanus for that foundation and defense. But Dr. Scrivener tells in so many words that the readings approved by Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome should closely agree. It is therefore conclusively evident that the Vaticanus Manuscript in Greek as the bulwark and defense of Jerome's version in Latin, would be a Eusebio-Origen manuscript.*

“Dr. Hoskier informs us that Drs. Wordsworth and White think Jerome used a codex very much resembling Aleph (Sinaiticus) and B (Vaticanus). (Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies* 11:194 note).”

Wilkinson<sup>12 p 195, 209 Section V</sup> therefore reiterates that “*Since the Constantine Bible containing both the O.T. and N.T. is proved to be a bible of the Eusebio-Origen type; and since B and Aleph are manuscripts of the Eusebio-Origen type, it follows then that the statement I made in my book is true, and not “unwarranted” as my Reviewers say; “The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know.”* See remarks under ***Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare***.

Neither the Reformers nor the King James translators were limited by not having direct access to א and B. To quote Wilkinson again, underlinings added, “*The problems presented by these two manuscripts were well known, not only to the translators of the King James, but also to Erasmus.*” It is Kutilek who is wrong.

Concerning Kutilek’s criticisms of Wilkinson’s comments on Erasmus and his work, see also remarks under ***The God-Honoured Text of the Reformation and 1611*** and ***Chapter 4***.

Kutilek:

“*Regarding Vaticanus (designated “B” ), Wilkinson claims that Erasmus had full access to this manuscript through friends in Rome. He states:*

“*...he was in correspondence with Professor Paulus Bombasius at Rome, who sent him such variant readings as he wished. (WB, p. 253)*

“*As authority for this information, Wilkinson cites “S P. Tregelles, On the Printed Text of the Greek Testament, p. 22” (WB, p. 253, note 22). Beyond being an imprecise presentation of the book’s title (the correct title is, An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament), the page in question gives a somewhat different picture. Erasmus didn’t request readings, only a reading: I John 5:7.*

“*“Erasmus requested his friend, Paulus Bombasius, at Rome, to examine the Codex Vaticanus for him as to this passage (emphasis added); and accordingly, in a letter, dated Rome, June 18, 1521, he sent him a transcript of the introductory verses of both the 4th and 5th chapters of St. John’s 1st article.”*

“*Wilkinson further records that another correspondent sent Erasmus a number of selected readings from B, and adds,*

“*“But Erasmus, however, rejected these variant readings of the Vatican manuscript because he considered from the massive evidence of his day the Received Text was correct.” (WB, p. 253).*

“*This absurd statement is not documented, as indeed it could not be, being wholly false. That Erasmus did not revise his Greek New Testament on the basis of these readings is true, but not surprising. First, he had received such a flood of criticism for not including I John 5:7 in his first two editions as to make him reluctant to risk more criticism by introducing major changes into his text. Second, only one edition of the Greek New Testament was issued by Erasmus between 1533 (the year he was sent the Vaticanus readings) and his death in 1536, i.e., the fifth edition of 1534. It was a virtual reprint of the 1527 edition, differing from it in as few as four places, according to one estimate (see Scrivener, A Plain Introduction, etc., p. 298).”*

Kutilek describes Wilkinson's statement that Erasmus was aware of "*variant readings of the Vatican manuscript*" as "*wholly false*" but then admits that Erasmus "*was sent the Vaticanus readings.*" Like his crony White, Kutilek is being 'inconsistent.'

Kutilek cites Tregelles to 'prove' that "*Erasmus didn't request readings, only a reading: I John 5:7*" but the quote from Tregelles that Kutilek uses refers to "*the introductory verses of both the 4th and 5th chapters of St. John's 1st article*" not merely one reading. Moreover, Kutilek neglects to mention that Wilkinson documented the source for the additional "*number of selected readings from B*" sent to Erasmus as that of Kenyon. In spite of a serious oversight such as this, Kutilek then gnat-strains about the imprecise title that Wilkinson gives Tregelles's book. Yet he accuses Wilkinson of not being scholarly!

Kutilek's statement is untrue with respect to the bulk of the criticisms Erasmus received. As Wilkinson<sup>12 p 226, 209 Section II, VI</sup> notes, the criticisms of Erasmus's New Testament did not stem from the exclusion of 1 John 5:7 from the earlier editions. They came from Erasmus's exposure of the corrupt Latin Vulgate of Jerome and its erroneous readings (proof in itself that Erasmus was acquainted with the *problems* of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, even if he never saw the actual manuscripts). Underlinings have been added.

"Writing to Peter Baberius August 13, 1521, Erasmus says:

"*"I did my best with the New Testament, but it provoked endless quarrels. Edward Lee pretended to have discovered 300 errors. They appointed a commission, which professed to have found bushels of them. Every dinner-table rang with the blunders of Erasmus. I required particulars, and could not have them."*"

"*When Erasmus published the Bibles in parallel he did not confine himself, as my Reviewers state, to printing only two Bibles in parallel, the Greek Text and the Catholic Vulgate. He printed three in parallel, the third parallel Bible being Erasmus' recension or revision of the Latin Vulgate. I quote again from Dr. Scrivener:*

"*"The fourth edition (dated March, 1527) contains the text in three parallel columns, the Greek, the Latin Vulgate and Erasmus' recension of it."* Scrivener, "Introduction", Vol. 2, page 186.

"Also another quote from Dr. Miller:

"*"A fourth edition exhibited the text in three parallel columns, the Greek, the Latin Vulgate, and a recension of the latter by Erasmus."* Miller's Textual Guide, p. 9

"*See also Tregelles, "Account of the Printed Text", p. 21. It was the third column, the revised Vulgate, that brought down the storm on Erasmus' head. I wonder how far my Reviewers have misled you?"*

"*His work shook the Roman Catholic Church, and his books were put on the Index. Luther and Erasmus were at first Catholic in name, but Protestants at heart. Erasmus was protesting. The Revisers, on the other hand, were Protestants in name, but ceased protesting; were Catholics at heart, and headed toward ritualism and Romanism.*

"*Erasmus was driving the world toward Protestantism, it was toward Catholicism that the Revisers were driving the world.*

"*Why tell the world again that all Erasmus printed in parallel columns was the Greek Testament and the Catholic Vulgate? Why not tell the whole truth? Why not tell the world and our dear people that he printed in a third column his revised Vulgate which brought down upon him the storm of Catholic Europe. Why not tell everybody, everywhere, that later the Pope put all his books on the Index Expurgatorius?... Will somebody*

*please tell me when the Pope put the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus on the Index Expurgatorius?”*

Kutilek is therefore wrong about the limited number of readings that Erasmus supposedly obtained from “*Paulus Bombasius, at Rome.*”

Kutilek:

*“Beyond these considerations, it is known that Erasmus agreed with the Vaticanus evidence on I John 5:7, and as I have pointed out elsewhere, Erasmus suspected that the doxology to the Lord’s prayer (Matthew 6:13), the ending of Mark (Mark 16:9-20), and the account of the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53-8:11) were not all original parts of the New Testament, and in every one of these cases, B and Erasmus were in agreement against the textus receptus. Erasmus believed, in summation, “the only way to determine the true text is to examine the early codices,” which, of course, would include Vaticanus (see my booklet, *Erasmus, His Greek Text, and His Theology*, p. 8, where I give my documentation: Roland Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom*, pp. 135-137). Rather than believing the received text was correct, Erasmus almost certainly, if alive today, would use a Greek New Testament like that of Nestle or the United Bible Society’s text.”*

If Erasmus “*agreed with the Vaticanus evidence on I John 5:7,*” why did he not include it in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> editions of his Greek New Testament? Kutilek does not say. Moreover, if Erasmus was aware of the major departures of B from the Textus Receptus that Kutilek lists above, how can Kutilek then insist that it was “*absurd*” and “*wholly false*” for Wilkinson to state that “*Erasmus...rejected these variant readings of the Vatican manuscript.*” Even Kutilek admits in effect that Erasmus must have known about these readings.

Kutilek insists that Erasmus’s reference to “*the early codices*” includes Vaticanus but as Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 938</sup> reveals, quoting the same source as Kutilek\* (Bainton), Erasmus was referring to “*a buried literature*” much of which he accessed in well-stocked libraries<sup>39 p 930</sup> in Rome, including that of his friend Angelo Colocci. Erasmus studied many ancient manuscripts that “*were later destroyed when the French besieged Rome in 1527*” but God had preserved their contents through Erasmus’s Greek text “*and the ancient manuscripts could be destroyed.*” Kutilek is clearly wrong to infer that Erasmus meant Vaticanus and its handful of disreputable allies in his reference to “*the early codices.*”

\*Dr Mrs Riplinger observes on the same page that Kutilek has used a non-existent reference to support his claim that Erasmus prepared his Greek text “*in great haste.*” Yet Kutilek accuses Wilkinson of not documenting sources – see above. ‘Pots and kettles’ again.

Contrary to Kutilek’s opinion, Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 941-2, 944</sup> shows, her emphasis, that Erasmus obtained *many* readings from Vaticanus via his friend Bombace, in addition to 1 John 5:7.

*“[Erasmus] was told by a friend in 1521 of an ancient Vatican codex (the now famous B) from which the Comma Joanneum was missing...[A] list of some 365 places was sent to him where B was in **agreement** with the Vulgate against the Greek the Greek manuscripts he had followed.”*

“*365 places*” corresponds roughly to the number of passages that Dr Moorman studied for departures from the AV1611 that stemmed largely from B. No doubt considerable overlap exists between these two sets of passages.



Dr Mrs Riplinger, her emphases, also reveals that Erasmus had much greater access to the writings of the church fathers than Kutilek suggests – though he uses the same source as Dr Mrs Riplinger, i.e. Bainton.

*“Erasmus further verified his Greek New Testament with scripture quotations seen in the writings of early Christian...he spent the first fifteen years of his studies almost wholly given to translating the early Christian writers of the first few centuries after Christ. In these writings from the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries, one finds evidence for **the Bible’s oldest readings**. They usually predate, by several hundred years, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus MSS, from which modern translations get their readings. Froben published Erasmus’ work on the ‘Fathers,’ as a series which included, Cyprian, Ireneaus, Chrysostom, Basil, Ambrose and numerous others...”*

*“Yale’s Professor Bainton states that Erasmus used, “translations...[and] quotations from the Scriptures in the work of the Church Fathers who wrote centuries **earlier than any manuscript** available to Erasmus”*

*“In Erasmus’ Ratio he, “denounces wrong quotations of the Fathers,” still seen today in the glossa [and Lexicons] – “truncated texts, wrenched from their contexts”... “[T]runcated” texts with only their trunk remaining, are used to support corrupt readings in today’s versions.”*

Which makes a lie of Kutilek’s assertion that *“Rather than believing the received text was correct, Erasmus almost certainly, if alive today, would use a Greek New Testament like that of Nestle or the United Bible Society’s text.”* Nestle and the UBS editions are *“[T]runcated” texts with only their trunk remaining,* as shown in detail via the works of Burgon, Miller, Scrivener, Hills, Pickering et alia, all of which Erasmus would have access to if alive today, in addition to the testimony of revival, church growth and missionary effectiveness of bibles from the Received Text, such as the AV1611, versus those from *“Nestle or the United Bible Society’s text.”* Where has Kutilek been?

And from the judgement of those *“who are least esteemed in the church”* 1 Corinthians 6:4b, as Wilkinson notes<sup>209</sup> Section VII, in a letter to him from Oxford University Press in March 1931. The letter’s disclosure is confirmed by two other prominent booksellers of the time, John C. Winston and A. J. Holman. Underlining has been added.

*““Some time ago the writer recalls having seen a statement attributed to the British and Foreign Bible Society, in which was said, that there were about 100 copies of the Authorized Version sold to every copy of the Revised.””*

Kutilek’s statement is fatuous.

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39</sup> p 939 states, rightly, *“Were Erasmus alive today, he would find that, in the main, he had managed to match almost all the over 5200 Greek manuscripts, and wisely ignore the other 44 corrupt ones. (If those critics [of Erasmus] had taken a course in Statistics in graduate school, they would have known that guesses like this are statistically impossible, given the fact that the Greek New Testament has about 140, 521 words.) Without the preservation of the text by God, try guessing all of them for yourself.”*

Dr Hills<sup>65</sup> p 198-9 comments as follows on Erasmus’s approach to variant readings, totally invalidating Kutilek’s objections to Wilkinson. Note that Dr Hills also states that Erasmus and therefore the Reformers and the King James translators were extremely well acquainted with the writings of the church fathers *and* of variant readings and/or omissions such as those found in  $\aleph$  and B, contrary to Kutilek’s criticisms of Wilkinson – see above.

How did Kutilek miss all this? Underlinings have been added. See also comments in **Chapter 4**. Dr Hills also documents the real source of attacks on Erasmus.

*“As an editor also [Erasmus’s] productivity was tremendous. Ten columns of the catalogue of the library in the British Museum are taken up with the bare enumeration of the works translated, edited, or annotated by Erasmus, and their subsequent reprints. Included are the greatest names of the classical and patristic world, such as Ambrose, Aristotle, Augustine, Basil, Chrysostom, Cicero, and Jerome. An almost unbelievable showing...*

***“Erasmus’ Notes - His Knowledge of Variant Readings and Critical Problems***

*“Through his study of the writings of Jerome and other Church Fathers Erasmus became very well informed concerning the variant readings of the New Testament text. Indeed almost all the important variant readings known to scholars today were already known to Erasmus more than 460 years ago and discussed in the notes (previously prepared) which he placed after the text in his editions of the Greek New Testament. Here, for example, Erasmus dealt with such problem passages as the conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer (Matt. 6:13), the interview of the rich young man with Jesus (Matt. 19:17-22), the ending of Mark (Mark 16:9-20), the angelic song (Luke 2:14), the angel, agony, and bloody sweat omitted (Luke 22:43-44), the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53 - 8:11), and the mystery of godliness (1 Tim. 3:16).*

*“In his notes Erasmus placed before the reader not only ancient discussions concerning the New Testament text but also debates which took place in the early Church over the New Testament canon and the authorship of some of the New Testament books, especially Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude and Revelation. Not only did he mention the doubts reported by Jerome and the other Church Fathers, but also added some objections of his own. However, he discussed these matters somewhat warily, declaring himself willing at any time to submit to “The consensus of public opinion and especially to the authority of the Church.” In short, he seemed to recognize that in reopening the question of the New Testament canon he was going contrary to the common faith.”*

Why didn’t Kutilek mention this? Why are his comments so one-sided? Why does he make such ‘selective’ use of the same sources, e.g. Bainton, Pickering, that both he and Dr Mrs Riplinger accessed?

Is it because a more comprehensive overview of Erasmus’s comments, such as Dr Hills provides, weakens, if not refutes, Kutilek’s contention that “*B and Erasmus were in agreement against the textus receptus*” with respect to the scriptures that Kutilek lists? Dr Hills continues.

*“But if Erasmus was cautious in his notes, much more was he so in his text, for this is what would strike the reader’s eye immediately. Hence in the editing of his Greek New Testament text especially Erasmus was guided by the common faith in the current text. And back of this common faith was the controlling providence of God. For this reason Erasmus’ humanistic tendencies do not appear in the Textus Receptus which he produced. Although not himself outstanding as a man of faith, in his editorial labors on this text he was providentially influenced and guided by the faith of others. In spite of his humanistic tendencies Erasmus was clearly used of God to place the Greek New Testament text in print, just as Martin Luther was used of God to bring in the Protestant Reformation in spite of the fact that, at least at first, he shared Erasmus’ doubts concerning Hebrews, James, Jude and Revelation.”*

Erasmus<sup>26</sup> was really, as stated in *The Epistle Dedicatory*, among those who said of themselves, “we are poor instruments to make God's holy truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they\* desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness.”

\*Including, like Kutilek, White etc., “self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil.”

Kutilek's next criticism of Wilkinson is with respect to the ancient versions.

#### **“Errors Regarding Ancient Versions**

“Wilkinson, writing in 1930, opted to follow the discredited opinion that the Peshitta Syriac version of the New Testament originated around 150 A.D. This view, common before 1900, is universally rejected today by informed writers because of research into the Bible text used by prominent Syrian Christian leaders Aphraates (d. 367 A.D.) and Ephraem (d. 373), as well as considerations regarding the Old Syriac version discovered in the 1800's. The evidence proving a 2nd century date impossible for the Peshitta favors a date between 373 and 431 A.D. (see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, pp. 56-63, for a detailed discussion).

“Wilkinson declares that the Peshitta generally follows the received text (WB, p. 198), a statement true only if one is being very general. The Peshitta does not include Luke 22:18, 19; John 7:53-8:11; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 28:29; I John 5:7; etc., and differs in many other particulars from the received text. As D. A. Carson has pointed out in *The King James Version Debate*,

““the textual affinity of the Peshitta to the Byzantine tradition has regularly been overestimated: the close work that has been done on some parts of it (especially Mark and Galatians) reflects Byzantine readings only about 50 percent of the time.” (p. 112).

“Wilkinson repeatedly asserts that the Old Latin translation is Byzantine in text, and that the Bible of the medieval Waldenses was made from the Old Latin instead of the Vulgate. Neither of these assertions is true. However, a detailed refutation of Wilkinson on these points must await a later issue, due to considerations of space (the curious reader may wish to consult *A History of the Baptists*, by Thomas Armitage, p. 295). [See also the article, “The Truth About the Waldensian Bible and the Old Latin Version,” by Doug Kutilek].”

“A detailed refutation of” Kutilek's assertions about the Old Latin translation and “the Bible of the medieval Waldenses” will be addressed in the next chapter. For now, note these comments from **Chapter 4** with respect to Kutilek's objections to the Holy Bible in Acts 19:20.

- “Mixtures of Old Latin and Vulgate readings” are the result of *deliberate corruption*, either by Origen, Jerome, or both in turn<sup>33 p 85, 98, 39 p 963</sup>, away from readings that match the AV1611. See Dr Ruckman's and Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks above concerning corruption of the Old Itala bibles. Their disclosures in this respect are important because Kutilek attempts to discredit<sup>84</sup> both Wilkinson's researches and the agreement between the Old Itala bibles and the AV1611 on his site. See supplementary chapter in this work, entitled *The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles* and remarks in **Chapter 3** on alleged ‘text types’ where Dr Moorman's findings indicate that the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions agree in ratio 2:1 and 3:1 respectively for the AV1611 versus the NIV with respect to the 356 doctrinal passages that Moorman addresses – passages that are most likely to

draw the attention of potential corrupters of scripture, 2 Corinthians 2:17. The following sites are helpful with respect to refuting Kutilek's attacks on the AV1611, its supporters and its sources<sup>85, 86</sup>.

- *"The Peshitta Syriac" is not "(5<sup>th</sup>)" century.* Its text is that of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century<sup>8 p 5, 33 p 61, 68, 65 p 172-4</sup>. The progenitor of the theory that the Peshitta originated in the 5<sup>th</sup> century was F. C. Burkitt, *an unsaved liberal*.

Dr Ruckman<sup>33 p 98-9</sup> has this observation. Emphases are his.

*"There are two types of Old Latin readings: European and African. The old European (Note: "Italy" – Itala) was the type Jerome (from ITALY) used to bring the Old Latin into line with the Pope (who was in ITALY). Any "Old Itala" would have been the right "Old Latin" BEFORE JEROME MESSED WITH IT, and consequently, any Old Latin would have been the right text in Africa before ORIGEN messed with it. Thus Jerome, Origen, and Augustine stand perpetually bound together as an eternal memorial to the depravity of Bible rejecting "Fundamentalists," who enthrone their egos as the Holy Spirit."*

Like James White (and Doug Kutilek). Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>39 p 963</sup>.

*"Jerome corrupted [the] pure Old Itala Bible in the fourth century. He admitted in his Preface. "You [Pope Damasus] urge me to revise the Old Latin and, as it were, to sit in judgment on the copies of Scriptures which are now scattered throughout the world...Is there not a man, learned or unlearned, who will not, when he takes the volume in hand...call me a forger and a profane person for having had the audacity to add anything to the ancient books, or to make changes..." In Jerome's Prologue to the Catholic Epistles, "Preserved in the Codex Fuldensis"...he admits that Christians "have pronounced to have me branded a falsifier and a corrupter of the Sacred Scriptures"...Even Metzger admits, "Jerome's apprehension that he would be castigated for tampering with the Holy Writ was not unfounded. His revision of the Latin Bible provoked both criticism and anger, sometimes with extraordinary vehemence.""*

Of the Peshitta, Dr Hills<sup>8 p 127-8, 65 p 172-4</sup> states, with updated references, *"The Peshitta Syriac version...agrees closely with the Traditional text found in the vast majority of Greek New Testament manuscripts. Until about one hundred years ago it was almost universally believed that the Peshitta originated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and hence was one of the oldest New Testament versions. Hence because of its agreement with the Traditional Text the Peshitta was regarded as one of the most important witnesses to the antiquity of the Traditional Text. In more recent times, however, naturalistic critics have tried to nullify this testimony...Burkitt (1904), for example, insisted that the Peshitta did not exist before the 5<sup>th</sup> century but "was prepared by Rabbula, bishop of Edessa (the capital city of Syria) from 411-435 A.D., and published by his authority."*

*"Now scholars are realising that the Peshitta must have been in existence before Rabbula's episcopate, because it was the received text of both of the two sects into which the Syrian Church became divided. Since this division took place in Rabbula's time and since Rabbula was the leader of one of these sects, it is impossible to suppose that the Peshitta was his handiwork, for if it had been produced under his auspices, his opponents would never have adopted it as their received New Testament text."*

Dr Hills comments further, his emphasis.

*"Indeed A. Voobus, in a series of special studies (1947-54)...has argued not only that Rabbula was not the author of the Peshitta but even that he did not use it, at least not in its present form. If this is true and if Burkitt's contention is also true, namely, that the*

*Syrian ecclesiastical leaders who lived before Rabbula also did not use the Peshitta, then why was it that the Peshitta was received by all the mutually opposing groups in the Syrian Church as their common, authoritative Bible? It must have been that the Peshitta was a very ancient version and that because it was so old the common people within the Syrian Church continued to be loyal to it regardless of the factions into which they came to be divided and the preferences of their leaders. It made little difference to them whether these leaders quoted the Peshitta or not. They persevered in their usage of it, and because of their steadfast devotion this old translation retained its place as the received text of the Syriac-speaking churches.”*

Dr Moorman<sup>9</sup> p 33-5, 39 raises concerns about the possibility of revisions to the Peshitta away from the Received Text, by the editors of the two available Peshitta versions today, one a Catholic and “*certainly no friend of the Reformation*” and the other who used another Syriac version, the Philoxenian, compiled by Bishop Philoxenus in the early 6<sup>th</sup> century AD, for the Books of 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude and Revelation. Dr Moorman concludes that the current *editions* (his emphasis) of the Peshitta “*may not adequately represent [its] manuscript testimony.*”

As indicated, Dr Moorman did a thorough study of 356 New Testament readings for important doctrinal passages in the available New Testament editions of the Peshitta and found that it supported the Received or AV1611 Text (where extant) against the modern or NIV text in 237 places versus 74, or in ratio 3:1.

Dr Moorman’s analysis of the Peshitta is clearly more thorough than Carson’s, or Kutilek’s. Dr Moorman<sup>11</sup> p 120 notes further, contrary to Kutilek’s opinion that “*The Peshitta does not include...1 John 5:7*” that “*In 1569, utilizing several Syriac Peshitta MSS Immanuel Tremellius prepared the second printed edition of the Syriac New Testament. (The first had been printed in 1555 by Albert Widmanstadt who had used two MSS). Tremellius placed 1 John 5:7, 8 in the margin of his edition. Giles Guthier, using two MSS published a Syriac edition at Hamburg in 1664. This edition places the passage in the text.*”

Again, Moorman’s analysis proves to be more searching than that of Kutilek, who is clearly wrong about the supposed 5<sup>th</sup> century date of the Peshitta, of which Dr Moorman states, “*The Peshitta was...declared (without a trace of evidence) to be a revision carried out by Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, in about 425.*” Kutilek cites no actual evidence for such a revision.

Clearly the conclusion that the Peshitta originated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century is not “*universally rejected today by informed writers*” as Kutilek supposes.

Kutilek refers to “*the Old Syriac version discovered in the 1800’s*” and cites Metzger for proof for the ‘impossibility’ of a 2<sup>nd</sup> century Peshitta. Dr Moorman states that only “*two really pitiful manuscripts known as the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac*” support “*the Old Syriac version.*” He adds, citing the same reference to Metzger that Kutilek does, that, his emphasis “*Both are but another example of that small group of early MSS which through the influence of Alexandria have been stripped of substantial doctrinal content...These are the only two “clear” examples of the so-called Old Syriac to be found, and Metzger’s attempt to explain this scarcity in comparison to the hundreds of Peshitta manuscripts betrays how weak the opposition is...In fact, Aland now admits “the Old Syriac...derives not from the II century but from the IV century”...*

*“But, keep in mind how necessary this “Old Syriac exercise” has been for Textual Criticism: a 2<sup>nd</sup> century Peshitta completely undermines their theory of early priority of early priority going to the Aleph-B Text.”*

And Kutilek’s. He concludes his attack on Wilkinson with some miscellaneous errors that amount to little more than gnat-straining.

**“Other Sundry Errors**

*“On p. 190, the date of the Counsel of Trent is given by Wilkinson as 1645, exactly a full century too late. Such a mistake (yes, it is in Wilkinson’s original work, OABV, p. 15, and is not a printer’s error in WB) in a book that claims to address historic events is inexcusable. The date, it is true, is part of a quote from a book by A. P. Stanley. Not having access to that book, I cannot be sure that the original mistake is not Stanley’s but if it was, Wilkinson - and Fuller, too - if he knew anything at all about church history, should have caught the mistake immediately, which he obviously did not (the dates of the counsel are correctly given in bold face heading in the middle of p. 235 as 1545-1563).”*

Having used a non-existent reference that he should have “caught” before publication – see Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comment above – Kutilek’s criticism is more ‘pots and kettles.’ He continues.

*“We are told matter-of-factly by Wilkinson that “Wycliff’s translation of the Bible into English was two hundred years before the birth of Martin Luther” (WB, p. 221). Again, Wilkinson missed the truth by a mere one hundred years. Wycliff’s translation is universally dated in the 1380’s, and Luther’s birth was in 1483; therefore, “he doth greatly err.””*

Change “two” to “one” and the error is fixed. The same cannot be said of the errors uncovered thus far in Kutilek’s article.

Kutilek:

*“We are given the undocumented assertion (p. 228) that Tyndale went to Cambridge to learn Greek at the feet of Erasmus. F. F. Bruce corrects this error when he writes,*

*““Erasmus left Cambridge in 1514, and Tyndale probably did not arrive there before 1516 at the earliest.” (The English Bible, 1st ed., p. 27).”*

An extract from the Encyclopedia Britannica<sup>219</sup> says of Tyndale that *“In Easter term 1510 he went to Oxford, where Foxe says he was entered of Magdalen Hall. He took his M.A. degree in 1515 and removed to Cambridge, where Erasmus had helped to establish a reputation for Greek and theology.”*

Rev Wylie<sup>95</sup> Volume III p 359 indicates that Tyndale was well-versed in Greek before he left Oxford, where he became an avid reader of Erasmus’s Greek New Testament, which students at Oxford had enthusiastically received. Tyndale *“began to give public lectures on this pure book.”* Opposition from the university authorities to these lectures compelled Tyndale to move to Cambridge where he continued his studies, no doubt by means of the facilities in *“Greek and theology”* that Erasmus had established. Wilkinson does not say that *“Tyndale went to Cambridge to learn Greek at the feet of Erasmus.”* He says that *“[Tyndale] went to Cambridge to learn Greek under Erasmus.”* The statement would only need a little clarification to indicate that Tyndale learnt more of New Testament Greek at Cambridge thanks to Erasmus’s influence on the curriculum.

Kutilek is hair-splitting.

Kutilek:

*“In discussing the collecting of variant readings from various Greek manuscripts, Wilkinson repeatedly confuses higher and lower criticism as though they were one and the same (see WB, pp. 265-268, 290, for some examples). Only someone very poorly acquainted with these two distinct disciplines would confuse them, yet Wilkinson (and Fuller as well) does so. (For a careful differentiation, see my article, “David Otis Fuller’s Deceptive Treatment of Spurgeon Regarding the King James Version”).”*

Comments have been limited to Kutilek’s criticism of Wilkinson in response. Kutilek’s objections are by no means new and he has overlooked Wilkinson’s own response<sup>209</sup> Section VII, underlinings in original.

*“The Reviewers seem to have reached the climax of their opposition to my book when they say,*

*“(d) “constructive textual criticism is confused with destructive higher criticism in unwarranted and fantastic ways.” (Section I, p.40) .*

*“Why do these writers forget that I have either quoted from or called attention to such outstanding textual critics as Dr. J. C. Reiche, Dr. F. C. Cook, Dr. H. C. Hoskier, Dr. Miller, also a secondary writer by the name of Dr. Mauro, who see just as I see, the Origenistic atmosphere of these Revised Versions and some speak very plainly about the hand of Rome and the hand of Modernism.*

*“To answer the last point about confusing lower and higher criticism, I will quote from that outstanding textual critic, Dr. H. C. Hoskier, who wrote in the year 1914 as follows:*

*““Finally, observe that up to the time of Westcott and Hort the ‘lower criticism’ had kept itself quite apart from so-called ‘higher criticism.’ Since the publication of Hort’s text, however; and of that of the Revisers, much of the heresy of our time has fallen back upon the supposed results acquired by the ‘lower criticism’ to bolster up their views. By a policy of indecision in the matter of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, truths specifically set forth by its founder, and by a decided policy, on the other hand, of decision in the matter of heresy in the field of lower criticism, the beliefs of many have been shaken not only to their foundations, but they have been offered free scope to play the Marcion and excise whatever appeared extra-ordinary or unintelligible to them. Many, who should have raised their voices against the mischief wrought have sat by in apathy or willfully fostered these heresies. Or, if not willfully, they have assumed a faltering attitude which caused their own students to misinterpret their masters’ lessons. Thus we have the spectacle of Thompson and Lake saying to Sanday: ‘We learned that from you’, and Sanday retorting: ‘I never meant to teach you that.’*

*““A man like the Dean of Durham, not content with preaching Christmas sermons at Westminster attacking the Virgin Birth and vapouring in the United States about the close atmosphere of the theological seminaries which he would like to burn to the ground, has now decided to introduce the ‘Revised Version’ officially into the ancient cathedral of Durham. I am therefore correct in coupling these matters.” Hoskier, “Codex B and Its Allies”, pp. 421,422, Vol. I. (Emphasis mine)*

*“Notice how these facts answer all the objections and complaints raised in the treatment of this question. This is all I have to say on this subject.”*

Kutilek:

“Wilkinson’s caricaturing and distortion of Westcott and Hort’s doctrinal views (WB, pp. 277-282) must be noted. I have addressed these matters elsewhere, and so direct the reader to that treatment (see Erasmus, *His Greek Text, and His Theology*, pp. 14ff).”

See remarks in **Chapter 4** on *Heresies of Westcott and Hort*<sup>92</sup> that Cloud<sup>6 Part 3</sup> summarises. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s<sup>14 p 397ff, 515ff</sup> summary of Westcott and Hort’s occultism and heathen philosophy.

Kutilek:

“On p. 279, Wilkinson remarks, “WESTCOTT writes to Archbishop Benson, November 17, 1865,” when in fact, according to the original source quoted, the letter was to J. B. Lightfoot and was written September 27, 1865. Such a demonstrated inability to accurately transcribe information does not engender confidence in the reliability of other information given. Fuller here erroneously gives the footnote as, “Ibid., Vol. II, p. 50” when the reference, correctly recorded by Wilkinson in OABV, p. 152, note 6, is “Idem, Vol. I, p. 251.””

Again, comments in response have been limited to Kutilek’s criticism of Wilkinson.

Kutilek fails to inform readers that the quote to which he refers is one of approximately 20 pieces of correspondence that Wilkinson cites in this part of his work, p 278-282. Wilkinson’s citations are therefore at least 95% correct, which is more than can be said for Kutilek’s criticisms of Wilkinson.

Kutilek:

“In passing, I cannot help but note Wilkinson’s condemnation of one of the Revised Version’s translation committees because eleven of its members “were fully determined to act upon the principle of exact and literal translation” (WB, p. 292)!”

Kutilek fails to give the full sentence, which reads, underlining added, “Citations from ten out of the sixteen members of the Committee, (sixteen was the average number in attendance), show that eleven members were fully determined to act upon the principle of exact and literal translation, which would permit them to travel far beyond the instructions they had received” i.e. by means of Westcott and Hort’s “strongly radical and revolutionary” Greek New Testament based on corrupt sources.

The determination of these 11 members was no doubt in part what prompted Burgon’s observation<sup>13 p 155</sup> that “The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout... We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far.”

Kutilek:

“Wilkinson misses the mark when he states (WB, p. 310) that the 13th chapter of Daniel, found in the Douay (Catholic) translation, “does not exist in the King James.” Of a truth, all the apocryphal books, including Daniel 13, were included in the original KJV of 1611, though in a separate section between the Old and New Testaments, not directly attached to or interspersed among the canonical 39 books of the Old Testament as in the Douay.”

Wilkinson did not say “the original KJV of 1611.” He said “the King James.” A typical, contemporary AV1611 does not contain any apocryphal books. A contemporary Douay-Rheims Bible, such as this author’s copy, *does*, including Chapters 13 and 14 added *directly* to the Book of Daniel. As Kutilek is forced to admit, these apocryphal chapters do



not follow Daniel 12 directly in the *Oxford Reprint of the [First] 1611 Edition* of the AV1611. But not only are they relegated separately to the Apocrypha, they are *not* called ‘Chapter 13’ and ‘Chapter 14’ as in the Douay-Rheims but ‘The History of Susanna’ and ‘The History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon.’ Kutilek is being economical with the truth.

Kutilek:

*“Informed readers will be surprised to learn (WB, p. 315), that the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai is a “Catholic Monastery.” Of course, it is not Catholic at all, but the oldest monastery of the Greek Orthodox Church (see Guy P. Duffield, Handbook of Bible Lands, p. 122). The Greek Orthodox are the same people who brought us the Byzantine text. A small error? Perhaps, but “the little foxes spoil the vines.” (Fuller recognized Wilkinson’s mistake and added a corrective footnote).”*

St Catherine’s Monastery is a Greek Orthodox community<sup>220</sup> but Greek Orthodoxy is part of Eastern Orthodoxy<sup>221</sup>, which split off from Roman Catholicism in the Great Schism<sup>222</sup> of 1054. Given that Sinaiticus is agreed to be a 4<sup>th</sup> century manuscript, i.e. originating up to 700 years before the Great Schism, it is definitely a Popish creation and most likely one of the fifty copies prepared by Eusebius at the behest of Constantine<sup>12 p 3</sup>, the first pope in an historical sense.

That is Wilkinson’s essential point, which Kutilek bypassed. As for those “*who brought us the Byzantine text,*” Kutilek has unwittingly reinforced Dr Mrs Riplinger’s<sup>39 p 955</sup> insightful conclusion, her emphases.

*“Authority must remain with the Bible in use, not with the critical edition of one man or one ecclesiastical tradition. Scrivener’s and Berry’s printed editions are not ‘authoritative’ or to be regarded as ‘the Original Greek’ “in microscopic points of detail,” where they differ from the manuscript tradition or the King James Bible and other great vernacular Bibles (Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 2, p 499)...These particular editions were never read and used by the masses of Greek-speaking true Christians.*

*“It must be remembered that even the 5200 existing handwritten Greek manuscripts were the product of the **Greek Orthodox Church**. Its membership has never been made up of true believers. The scriptures have been entrusted to the priesthood of true believers, just as they were entrusted to the Hebrew priests in the Old Testament. Unbelievers, Greek speaking or otherwise, cannot discern spiritual things...”*

The Old Testament Hebrew scriptures were preserved for centuries up until the advent of printing by the Hebrew Masoretic scribes<sup>8 p 7</sup>, who were never part of the Body of Christ as such. Is not this as great a potential problem for Kutilek as he perceives “*The Greek Orthodox*” to be for bible believers? And whom does he suppose ‘preserved’ the Alexandrian manuscripts א and B that he appears to prefer? It is Rome that champions these corrupt sources in her counterfeit bibles that modern version editors have been duped into following. See Tables 2-9.

And what has Kutilek got to say to Burgon’s detailed evaluation of these documents that underlie any and every “*Greek New Testament like that of Nestle or the United Bible Society’s text*”? See **Chapter 3**. Kutilek provides no answer to any of these questions.

Kutilek:

*“It is stated (WB, p. 316) that with the KJV translated in 1611, just before the Puritans left England for America, they brought it with them to America. Fuller’s footnote identifies these travellers to the New World as the “Pilgrim Fathers” who sailed on the May-*

flower, who arrived here in late 1620. If Fuller is correct about Wilkinson's meaning, then they both are in error. None of the Mayflower occupants were Puritans, and furthermore, the Pilgrims brought, not the KJV, but the Geneva Bible dating from 1560.

“*The Pilgrims brought the Geneva Bible with them on the Mayflower to Plymouth in 1620. In fact, the religious writings and sermons published by the members of the Plymouth colony suggest that the Geneva Bible was used exclusively by them in the colony's earliest days. (The Geneva Bible, a facsimile of the 1560 edition, 1969, Introduction by Lloyd E. Berry, p. 22).*”

“*The chronicler of Plymouth Plantation, William Bradford, generally quoted the Geneva Bible in his account, not the KJV (Samuel Eliot Morrison, ed., Of Plymouth Plantation, 1952, Introduction, p. xxiii).*”

Wilkinson has used the term “Puritans” loosely, although Kutilek makes no allowance for such a generic usage and has misled readers again. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*<sup>136</sup> and church historian Earle E. Cairns<sup>223 p 335-8</sup> show that the Puritans were originally members of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Church of England who objected to “*the continued use in the liturgy of the church of ritual [e.g. Latin names for prayers, such as the Magnificat for Luke 1:46-55] and vestments that seemed popish to them [these practices formed part of what is called ‘High Church’]. They opposed the use of saints’ days, clerical absolution, the sign of the Cross [still used in the C of E to ‘bless’ a congregation at the close of a service], the custom of having god-parents in baptism, kneeling for Communion, and the use of the surplice [long-sleeved, full-length white linen garment] by the minister.*” See also *The History of The Christian Church*<sup>224, p 388-9</sup>, *Puritans and Separatists* for a concise overview of these groups and their development.

The Puritans accepted the Bible as “*the infallible rule for faith and life,*” condemned “*extreme fashions in dress, laxity in keeping Sunday, and...lack of consciousness of sin*” and later urged for “*a Presbyterian or...Congregational state church.*” The former is a form of church government with bishops or elders elected by the congregation instead of appointed by the monarch. The latter form, whose adherents were also known as Independents, urged for “*each congregation...to be left free in the state church to choose its own pastor, determine its policies, and manage its own affairs.*”

Many Puritans, including some Congregationalists, left the state church entirely and became Separatists. Having thereby set aside the Church of England's Articles of Religion, they adopted “*the idea of a church covenant by which the Separatists bound themselves in loyalty to Christ and one another apart from a state church.*” (Cairns has informative diagrams showing the emergence of the Separatist and non-Separatist groups from the original Puritans.)

Persecution by the state church hierarchy drove a Separatist group from Scrooby, Lincolnshire, led by John Robinson, to Holland. Members of this group eventually emigrated to the then American colonies in the Mayflower in 1620, to be known ever afterwards as the Pilgrim Fathers. (Robinson did not accompany them but gave his encouragement to the émigrés, nevertheless.) Another Separatist leader was Robert Browne, called a Puritan Separatist<sup>136</sup>, although he eventually returned to the Anglican Church in 1591 where he was ordained in the same year. However, many followers of his, called Brownists, remained Puritan Separatists and some of these sailed with the Mayflower.

Cairns notes the Separatist ethos of the Mayflower company, who “*applied the covenant idea to political life by entering into the Mayflower Compact before landing at Plymouth [Massachusetts, New England].*”

Paine<sup>25 p 139-141</sup> explains about the Mayflower Pilgrims, their identity and their bible – and why they were initially reluctant to accept the 1611 translation, a difficulty that Kutilek apparently didn't think of in his superficial treatment of their history. Note, as Paine indicates, Puritans who remained within the state church, were certainly willing to persecute former fellow Anglicans who had left to join the Separatists.

*“How much did the King James Bible impress itself on the Plymouth Pilgrims? Three of their preachers, though they never came to Plymouth, were Henry Ainsworth, Henry Jacob, and John Robinson. There is almost nothing to show that any of them ever used the King James Bible.*

*“Those who cut themselves off from the English Church often chose to divorce themselves from the Church Scriptures too, and to use a Bible less tainted, as it seemed to them – e.g. the Geneva – or to make their own translations, if they were capable of it...*

*“From Robinson's sometimes piquant writings, which include many verses from the old Bibles, we get the picture of a beloved antique.*

*“The Pilgrims, among them remnants of the Brownists, were almost as much against the Puritans [who remained within the Church of England] as they were against the high churchmen [see above] and the papists. So they were slow, it appears, to accept the King James Bible, put out by those who had harassed them. In the long run the 1611 Bible, because of its stature, triumphed with the Pilgrims as with their old foes, except those in the Church of Rome, [surprise, surprise!] and to it they referred all details of daily living.”*

Wilkinson's statement and Dr Fuller's note may need some clarification but it is clear from the above that Kutilek's criticism is both harsh and unwarranted. And the caveat “in the colony's earliest days” in Kutilek's reference to Berry's facsimile edition of the Geneva Bible should not go unnoticed. Note further that Wilkinson does not explicitly refer to the Mayflower Pilgrims and Dr Fuller's note simply marks an early pivotal event in the great exodus of English-speaking believers to the New World to escape church-state tyranny that took many decades to subside, the Protestant Reformation notwithstanding. Rome's persecuting spirit died hard. As Cushing Biggs Hassell<sup>225 Chapter XVII</sup> states, “The Church of England for a long time imitated the tyrannical and persecuting spirit of her old mother, Rome. It was particularly during the infamous reigns of Charles II and James II (1660-1688) that the Baptists were persecuted in England.” Protestant persecutions in England, no doubt thanks to the influence of the 1611 Bible, ceased during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, by the year 1700 according to Halley<sup>116 p 793</sup>.

Dr Ruckman<sup>226</sup> notes, citing church historian Newman, “Nearly 20,000 Puritans followed the Mayflower group from 1629 to 1640 in protest against having to use the Anglican PRAYER BOOK.” This finding further vindicates Wilkinson's statement, which, as shown, does not have to be limited to the Mayflower Pilgrims.

Kutilek:

*“In parts of OABV which Fuller did not reproduce in WB, Wilkinson kept up his usual performance. On page 209, he condemns the Revised Version for not following the Latin Vulgate at John 14:2; on p. 216, he criticizes the Revised Version for rendering I Corinthians 15:4 literally; and on p. 253, he misapplies Psalm 12:6-7, incorrectly presuming the verses are a promise of Divine preservation of the Scriptures, when in fact they are a promise of Divine protection for persecuted saints of v. 5. (I established this latter interpretation as certainly correct in “A Careful Investigation of Psalm 12:6-7,” The Biblical*

*Evangelist*, 17:21, October 14, 1983. See also the commentaries of John Gill and Franz Delitzsch).”

Kutilek’s “*latter interpretation*” of Psalm 12:6-7 is certainly incorrect. See comments, particularly those of Dr Ruckman, in **Chapter 10**. Moreover, Dr Fuller *did* reproduce Wilkinson’s (correct) application of Psalm 12:6-7. It is found in Wilkinson’s Conclusion<sup>12 p 313</sup>, which is Chapter 16 of the unabridged work.

Wilkinson here states, “*In the Bible is revealed the standard by which we shall be tried when the judgment day comes. From the garden of Eden until now, one standard and one only has been revealed. Inspiration declares that this revelation has been under the special protection of all power in heaven and earth. “The words of the Lord are pure words,” says the Psalmist [from the AV1611], “as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve every one of them, (margin) from this generation forever.” Psalm 12:6,7. Lonely mounds in distant lands mark the graves where fell those who forsook home and civilization that the Word of God might live.*”

The context of Wilkinson’s comment, the Judgement Seat of Christ, Romans 14:10 and the labours of those paid the ultimate sacrifice for the scriptures show unequivocally why Kutilek opted for his erroneous “*latter interpretation*.”

Kutilek has imposed a distorted interpretation on Wilkinson’s remarks, The unabridged online version<sup>12 Chapter 12</sup> of *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* states the following with respect to John 14:2, 1 Corinthians 15:4. Wilkinson’s explanatory comments<sup>209 Section VI</sup> follow in each case. Note that these verses are but 2 of the 12 passages that Wilkinson addresses in detail in his Chapter 12. Even Kutilek appears to be unable to find fault with Wilkinson’s comments on the other 10.

### **“The Large Hope — Another Chance After Death**

“John 14:2

“KING JAMES: “*In my Father’s house are many mansions.*”

“REVISED: “*In my Father’s house are many abiding places.*” (Margin.)

“*In the following quotation from the Expositor, the writer points out that, by the marginal reading of the Revised, Dr. Westcott and the Committee referred, not to a final future state, but to intermediate stations in the future before the final one.*

““*Dr. Westcott in his Commentary on St. John’s Gospel gives the following explanation of the words, “In my Father’s house are many mansions.” “The rendering comes from the Vulgate mansiones, which were “resting places,” and especially the “stations” on a great road, where travellers found refreshment. This appears to be the true meaning of the Greek word here; so that the contrasted notions of repose and progress are combined in this vision of the future.*”

““*For thirty years now,” said Dr. Samuel Cox, in 1886, “I have been preaching what is called ‘the larger hope,’ through good and ill report.*””

Wilkinson’s explanatory comment, his underlining:

“*John 14:2 On Mansions. Author’s Title:*

“*The Larger Hope - Another Chance After Death*

“*It is evident that the Revisers saw in these “mansions”, as they say in their margin, “abiding places” or stations on the road in the intermediate state, if my Reviewers did*

*not. Read the quotations in my book from Bishop Westcott and Mr. Cox. These prove that the Revisers intended to breathe their doctrine into the margin, whether my Reviewers get it out of the margin or not.*"

Wilkinson is not condemning *"the Revised Version for not following the Latin Vulgate at John 14:2."* He is condemning them for false doctrine, inserted by means of a marginal note with respect to the supposed *"true meaning of the Greek word here"* according to Westcott. Wilkinson continues.

***"Entire Meaning of Great Crises in Christian Life Changed***

*"1 Corinthians 15:3,4*

*"KING JAMES: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day."*

*"REVISED: "... that He was buried; and that He hath been raised on the third day."*

*"In this text, "He rose," has been changed to, "He hath been raised," for a definite purpose. We lay a charge against the triumvirate [Westcott, Hort, Lightfoot] who swept the Revision Committee along with them, of deliberately making changes in order to introduce a new set of doctrines which would be neither Presbyterianism (Protestantism) or Episcopalianism, but which would favor Romanism..."*

Wilkinson follows with a quote from Westcott in a letter to Hort, where Westcott declares that *"I should like to have the Incarnation as a center, and on either side the preparation for it, and the apprehension of it in history."*

Wilkinson shows from a careful analysis of Westcott's letter that *"it can be seen that the new set of doctrines they planned to advocate could be nothing else than Ritualism and Romanism. Evidently, the Revisers incorporated their theology into the Scriptures. This is not the function of revisers or translators."* Wilkinson describes how the Reviser's translation in 1 Corinthians 15:4 fitted Romish teaching on the Atonement.

*"Many Protestants are not aware of the serious difference between the papal doctrine of Atonement and theirs; nor of the true meaning of the Mass. Catholics teach that only the humanity of Christ died on the cross, not His divine nature. Therefore, in their eyes, His death was not, in a primary sense, a vicarious atonement to satisfy the wrath of God against sin and pay the claims of a broken law...Because of this, His death is to them only a momentary event; while His coming in the flesh, or the doctrine of the Incarnation, is supreme. Its effects are continual and daily, a source of saving grace, as they believe. The turning of the bread into the body of Christ, by the priest in the ceremony of the Mass, represents His birth in the flesh, or the Incarnation, repeated in every Mass.*

*"So fundamental to all their beliefs is this different view of the Atonement and of the Mass, as held by Roman Catholics, that it profoundly affects all other doctrines and changes the foundation of the Christian system. When the triumvirate approached their task of revision, with their scheme to advocate their new system of doctrines, Dean Farrar says that "hundreds of texts" were so changed that the Revisers restored conceptions "profound and remarkable" in the "verbs expressive of the great crises of Christian life."...*

*"On the text under consideration — 1 Corinthians 15:3,4 — Dean Farrar, interpreting it in the new meaning the Revisers intended for it to have, said:*

““When St. Paul says that ‘Christ was buried and hath been raised,’ he emphasizes, by a touch, that the death and burial of Christ were, so to speak, but for a moment, while His Resurrection means nothing less than infinite, permanent, and continuous life.”

“It is apparent by this translation they mean to minimize the death of Christ and to magnify His resurrection, which to them is substantially a repeated Incarnation. This tends to the Roman idea of Transubstantiation in the Mass. They belittle the death of Christ when they rule out the death of His divine nature. That leads to the conclusion that there was no divine law to be satisfied. Dr. Farrar ought to know what was intended, for he was one of the coterie in which Westcott and Hort moved.”

This sample of the RV’s *“doctrines of devils”* 1 Timothy 4:1b is largely preserved in 3 prominent modern versions; the NIV, NASV, NRSV, which all have the passive expression *“was raised”* along with the JB and Ricker Berry’s Interlinear translation<sup>62</sup>. Nestle and the NWT are in essential agreement with the NIV, NASV, NRSV, JB, Ricker Berry but closer to the RV with *“has been raised.”* The NKJV, DR, JR agree with the AV1611 but the triumvirate’s *“pernicious ways”* 2 Peter 2:2 have cast a long shadow.

Wilkinson’s explanatory comment, underlinings in original:

*“1.Cor.15:3,4 On Tense change affecting Great Crises of Christian Life.*

*“My Reviewers seek to parry the indictment that the Revisers change tense forms so as to throw the meaning of the great crises in Christian life, towards the teachings of Rome. But did I not (1) quote Dean Farrar when he truly claims that the Revisers’ change of tense form did change the meaning of the crises in Christian life; (2) and did I not quote Westcott, and other Revisers, that they sought to permeate Christendom with their conception of doctrines whose meaning to them was neither Presbyterian or Episcopalian, but whose meaning I showed to be Romish? I wish now to give a quotation from one of the learned nobility of England to the effect that the Apostles never made such distinction of tense forms as both the Reviewers and the Revisers claim they did. I now quote from Lord Edmund Beckett:*

*““...Such rules are probably right enough generally (in the sense of usually), so far that there is a presumption in favor of observing them, but certainly no more, as we shall see continually. And as all such rules can only be a matter of induction from experience in the books to which they are intended to be applied, and cannot be deduced from any axioms or necessary truths, as in mathematics, the assertion that any such rule is universal is at once refuted by finding that it would sometimes produce absurd or manifestly wrong results...The English speaking people of the world want the English Bible to express the full and substantial meaning of the writers of the original in the best way, and not in the way that is used to test school boys; knowledge of the parsing of every word. It is nothing to us whether Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, Jude and the uncertain writer of Hebrews, all mind their aorists and articles, participles, and particles, as good scholars may expect them to have done, but as it is clear that they did not; because we find it sometimes makes nonsense or confusion to assume that they did.” Beckett, “Revised N.T.” pp. 14,15.*

*“My Reviewers emphasize the fact that the Greek verb here is in the present perfect passive form. Well what of it? It is used intransitively here, and when so used can be translated to awake, to arise, which is not passive. (See Robinson’s Greek and English Lexicon, p. 218.) If then, it could be translated the way it now is in the King James Version, and so fits in [without grammatical difficulty] with the two other verbs [“**died**,” “**was buried**”], why did they not do it? Why did they not leave it alone as it was in the AV, and*

*in there correctly? Why make the change, I repeat? Dean Farrar revealed that it was in this very verse THAT they made the change to minimise the death of Christ, and to magnify his resurrection, which is the doctrine of triumvirate. Westcott, Hort and Lightfoot, who had fully determined ten years before Revision began to find expressions to their convictions. Rome and Romanizers also minimize the death and magnify the resurrection of Christ. Such a belief strikes both at the Atonement and at the seventh day Sabbath, bringing in Sunday\*.”*

\*As a 7<sup>th</sup> Day Adventist<sup>227 p 11-14</sup>, Wilkinson may have attached undue emphasis to Sabbath (Saturday) keeping. Otherwise, his remarks on the Romanizing readings of the RV are sound.

Wilkinson has clearly analysed the verses that Kutilek mentions in considerable detail and reached satisfactory conclusions. Inspection of Wilkinson’s actual statements with respect to John 14:2, 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4 show that once again, Kutilek’s criticisms are both unwarranted and deceitful.

Kutilek:

**“Conclusion**

*“I do not pretend that this is anything close to an exhaustive listing and analysis of Wilkinson’s errors in OABV or those parts in WB. So abundant are they that to address them all would require a work at least five times longer than the present article, and more. However, these examples are adequate to demonstrate beyond honest cavil the wholly unreliable nature of Wilkinson’s writings. Even Fuller, Wilkinson’s advocate and republisher, was cognizant to some not inconsiderable degree of his inaccuracy, and sought to mask it with numerous footnotes. Beyond his concealing Wilkinson’s cultic doctrine, Fuller did a gross disservice to conservative Christianity by passing off as authoritative - “an excellent work,” to use Fuller’s own phrase - a production so marred and defective in every way. Instead of helping resolve the text and translation controversy, Fuller, by virtue of his republication of Wilkinson, has created (again to use Fuller’s own words) “such profound confusion in Christian circles” (WB, p. 174). He has gotten for himself such a blot on his escutcheon as shall tarnish his reputation as long as his memory shall endure among the living.”*

What is “beyond honest cavil” is that Kutilek’s criticisms of Wilkinson “are adequate to demonstrate...the wholly unreliable nature of” of Kutilek’s own writings. Not one of his manifold criticisms, apart from a couple of minor historical oversights (the first-mentioned date of the Council of Trent, the timing of Martin Luther’s birth) has any substance in reality and Kutilek has repeatedly misled readers on matters of major church and biblical historical import. Moreover, he has failed completely, like Wilkinson’s Reviewers before him, to address the 8 “main lines of argument” that Wilkinson set forth and which are listed at the start of this chapter. Kutilek’s article can therefore, as already indicated, rightly be dismissed as largely nothing more than gnat-straining, Matthew 23:24.

This study has shown further that Kutilek’s criticisms addressed in detail in this chapter in no way impugn the citations from Wilkinson that form much of the basis for the early part of this work.

Attention is now drawn to Kutilek’s specific criticism of the belief that the bibles of the Waldenses were from the uncorrupted Old Latin and not Jerome’s Vulgate.

## Chapter 12 – “The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles”

Doug Kutilek has a blatantly obvious strategy to destroy bible belief and replace it with himself or his cronies as the final arbiters of what God said and where God said it.

Kutilek is present-day proof of the Earl of Shaftesbury’s prophetic warning uttered over 150 years ago in 1856<sup>8 p 45-6</sup>.

*“When you are confused or perplexed by a variety of versions, you would be obliged to go to some learned pundit in whom you reposed confidence, and ask him which version he recommended; and when you had taken his version, you must be bound by his opinion. I hold this to be the greatest danger that now threatens us. It is a danger pressed upon us from Germany, and pressed upon us by the neological spirit of the age. I hold it to be far more dangerous than Tractarianism, or Popery, both of which I abhor from the bottom of my heart. This evil is tenfold more dangerous, tenfold more subtle than either of these, because you would be ten times more incapable of dealing with the gigantic mischief that would stand before you”*

Kutilek’s bible-subverting strategy is conspicuous in his attempt<sup>228</sup> to prove that Waldensian bibles are derived mainly, if not solely from Jerome’s Vulgate, the text of which, Kutilek maintains, is essentially that of the Old Latin and vice versa (i.e. the Old Latin is not a valid witness to the Traditional Text as found in the AV1611). He states, while, as in the previous chapter, also seeking to discredit the researches<sup>12</sup> of Benjamin Wilkinson.

*“Wilkinson claimed also that the Received Text had authority enough to become, either in itself or by its translation, “the Bible of...the Waldensian Church of northern Italy,” (Our Authorised Bible Vindicated, p.24; Which Bible?, p.197). “The noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text,” (OABV, p.42; WB, p.214). “The Latin Vulgate...was different from the Bible of the Waldenses,” (OABV, p.22; WB, p.195). This received text supposedly possessed by the Waldensians was alleged to be in the form of a Latin translation, the Old Latin or Itala version, which predates the Vulgate: “They [i.e., the Waldenses] knew and possessed the Vulgate. But the Italic, the earlier Latin, was their own Bible, the one for which they lived and suffered and died,” (OABV, p.28; WB, p.201).*

*“Wilkinson summarily said, “Some authorities speak of the Waldenses as having as their Bible, the Vulgate. We regret to dispute these claims,” (OABV, p.28; WB, p.201). And well should Wilkinson have regrets, for his disputation is utterly groundless!”*

Citing Neander’s *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. IV, p 608, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1853, Kutilek states, *“The Waldensians having produced this translation, “sent delegates from their body to pope Alexander the Third, transmitting to him a copy of their Romance version of the Bible, and soliciting his approbation as well as that of their spiritual society.” It is highly unlikely that the Waldensians would have submitted such a version to the pope for approval if it were not Vulgate-based.”*

Citing Wylie, *History of the Waldenses*, p 11-12, Kutilek asserts further, author’s emphases.

*“Mr. J. A. Wylie, in his book, **History of the Waldenses** (1870, 4th ed.), reported, “The ‘Lingua Romana,’ or Romaunt tongue, was the common language of the south of Europe from the eighth to the fourteenth century...Into this tongue - the Romaunt - was the first translation of the whole of the New Testament made so early as the twelfth century. This fact Dr. Gilly has been at great pains to prove in his work, **The Romaunt Version of the Gospel according to John** [1848]. The sum of what Dr. Gilly, by a patient investigation*



*into the facts, and a great array of historic documents, maintains, is that all the books of the New Testament were translated from the Latin Vulgate...into the Romaunt, that this was the first literal version since the fall of the empire, that it was made in the twelfth century, and was the first translation available for popular use...it was made, as Dr. Gilly, by a chain of proofs, shows, most probably under the superintendence and at the expense of Peter Waldo of Lyons, not later than 1180," (pp. 12, 13).*

*"Here, then, is the conclusion of the acknowledged expert in the field: the Waldensian Bible was made from the Vulgate. An examination of Gilly's work directly provides a little more detail to the picture. Gilly [from *The Romaunt Version of the Gospel According to John*, by William Stephen Gilly] plainly states about the translators of the Romaunt version that, "They used the Vulgate of Jerome for their text" (p. xcix) while at the same time he points out that that Vulgate text was of an occasionally mixed character. At certain points, the Roumant [Romaunt] version will agree now with one, now with another of the Old Latin manuscripts. Gilly notes seven such agreements in John with OL ms. "a," six with "b," five with "f," and three with "d" (p. c). Consulting Gilly's notes on pp.93-114 reveals that these Old Latin manuscript agreements with the Roumant [Romaunt] against the Vulgate are nearly always exceedingly minute - a matter of punctuation, the spelling of a proper name, occasionally the deletion of a clause (e.g., "who is over all," John 3:31; "for Jews have no dealings with Samaritans," John 4:9). In many of these cases, there are OL mss. on both sides of the reading, and in apparently none of the cases does the OL reading agree with the received Greek text against the Vulgate, while in several cases, the OL reading corresponds with the Vaticanus Greek manuscript, the chief witness in the Gospels to the Alexandrian text. The late F. F. Bruce briefly alluded to these occasional Old Latin readings in the Waldensian Bible, and characterized these readings as Western (not Byzantine). See **The Books and the Parchments**, pp. 217, 218, 3rd edition, 1963.*

*"It is not in the least surprising to discover that medieval Vulgate manuscripts used by the Waldensians would display a mixed text with infrequent readings of minor import corresponding to some Old Latin manuscripts. Indeed, a chief characteristic of medieval Vulgate manuscripts is the incredible amount of mixture in the texts. However, the presence of a few Old Latin readings (and of a non-Byzantine sort) in the Waldensian Bible in no way makes theirs an Old Latin Bible, any more than the presence of a few Byzantine readings in the Sinaiticus makes it a typically Byzantine manuscript, or the presence of some 90 Latin Vulgate readings in the King James Version New Testament makes it a non-Byzantine-based translation. The Waldensian Bible was in all essential points a translation of the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, as was the later English translation of John Wycliffe. Wilkinson's wishing otherwise does not make it so."*

Kutilek is of course wrong about Wycliffe's Bible. See remarks on Wycliffe's Bible versus Jerome's Vulgate in **Chapter 8** and the previous chapter, with respect to White's table<sup>3 p 194-5</sup> of names and titles of God and the Lord Jesus Christ. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks<sup>39 p 788ff</sup> with respect to Wycliffe and the Vulgate.

Kutilek cites 26 examples from the New Testament to show the departure of the Old Latin from the Received Text underlying the AV1611 in an attempt to merge the texts of the Old Latin and Jerome's Vulgate and therefore provide further specific 'proof' that the Waldenses had no bible other than the text of Jerome's Vulgate. Kutilek then says of these examples.

*"These 26 examples gleaned practically at random from the apparatus of *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition, 1975, published by the United Bible Societies, represent only a*

*small fraction of the Old Latin departures from the received text (as well as from the Byzantine text). Very many more could be listed, but surely these are enough to refute the false claim that the Old Latin in any of its forms is Byzantine in text type.”*

Kutilek concludes.

*“Let us hear then the conclusion of the matter: once again Wilkinson has been exposed as exceedingly unreliable and inaccurate in his writing on the text/translation issue. He is completely wrong in his claim that the Old Latin version is a Latin translation corresponding closely to the received Greek text. And he is greatly mistaken in his bold but unfounded assertion that the Bible of the medieval Waldensians was made from the Old Latin, rather than the Latin Vulgate. It must also once again be pointed out that J. J. Ray and David Otis Fuller adopted without foundation the false views of Wilkinson, and, what is worse, helped spread Wilkinson’s misinformation through their republication of his work.”*

Note that Kutilek has essentially based his denunciations of Wilkinson, Ray and Fuller and his verdict on all Waldensian Bibles on 26 New Testament readings from the critical apparatus of the UBS New Testament and on Gilly’s evaluation, although detailed, of one Book, the Gospel of John, of a Medieval Waldensian Bible, the Romaunt Version. The Romaunt John’s Gospel will be considered later but it should be recognised that inspection of Wilkinson’s statement quoted by Kutilek above shows that Wilkinson was referring specifically to “*the Old Latin or Itala version,*” not the Romaunt Version.

The main issues are, therefore,

- Is the Old Latin text a reflection of the Traditional Text or of Jerome’s Vulgate?
- If the Romaunt Gospel of John largely reflects Jerome’s Vulgate, did the Waldensians possess other bibles that followed the Traditional Text instead of Jerome’s Vulgate?

These issues will be addressed in turn.

### ***The Old Latin Versus Jerome’s Vulgate***

Will Kinney gives an effective refutation of Kutilek’s claim about the nature of the Old Latin that may be found on these sites<sup>85, 86, 210</sup>.

Kinney discusses all of Kutilek’s 26 examples in turn and compares readings between the Old Latin, the AV1611 and several modern versions, including the UBS text, NIV, NASV, NRSV. Kinney notes that the modern versions are repeatedly in conflict between themselves with respect to Kutilek’s 26 examples. He also puts these examples in context with the far weightier witness of the Old Latin to 17 verses of scripture that are in the AV1611 but not in the modern versions.

Kinney states.

#### ***“The Old Latin Version and the King James Bible Readings***

*“There are at least 17 entire verses omitted from the New Testament in such modern versions as the NIV, RSV, ESV, and the NASB. The NIV omits all 17 of these verses, while the RSV, ESV omit even more, and the NASBs vary from one edition to the next, omitting all these verses in some editions and replacing some of them in others.*

*“All these seventeen whole verses are found in the ancient Old Latin Version which dates from around 157 A.D., and was in use through the 1500’s. These 17 whole verses are also found in the Greek texts that underlie the King James Bible. The point of this study is to show how all of the major disputed textual readings are found this ancient Bible ver-*

sion that is approximately 200 years older than the Greek texts used in the translation of most modern bible versions like the NASB, NIV, RSV, and the new ESV all of which are based primarily on the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts.

*“Listed in this study are the principal disputed verses which are found in the Authorized King James Holy Bible, and in the ancient Old Latin Version, but are omitted in the modern versions based on the very different Westcott-Hort Greek text. The following verses are found in all, most or some of the few remaining Old Latin manuscripts. There undoubtedly were hundreds if not thousands of such Old Latin Bibles in existence throughout the centuries, but today we have only a few remaining, partial copies.”*

The verses that Kinney lists are as follows, together with additional disputed readings that he addresses in his article; Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14, Mark 7:16, 9:44, 46, 11:26, 15:28, Luke 9:55-56, 17:36, John 5:3b-4, Acts 8:37, 9:5-6, 15:34, 24:6-8, 28:29, Romans 16:24, 1 John 5:7-8. Many of these verses have been discussed earlier in this work. See in particular **Chapter 7** and **Part Two**. Kinney continues.

*“You will notice that most of Mr. Kutilek's examples are quite insignificant and in many of these the Old Latin readings are divided, some siding with the KJB and others not. You will also notice that he mentions only 11 or 12 of the Old Latin manuscripts; not the readings for the others among the 35 copies listed by Jack Moorman<sup>229 p 102ff</sup> [at the time of writing, see citation from Dr Moorman's later work<sup>9 p 28ff</sup>]...”*

*“When we compare the 17 or more entire verses that are omitted by the modern versions in the New Testament, we see that they all are found in both the King James Bible, the Old Latin copies, and in other Greek manuscripts. The general text of the few remaining Old Latin copies gives overwhelming evidence for the authenticity of the readings found in the Authorized Version.*

*“This is why Doug Kutilek and Gary Hudson have tried to convince us that the Old Latin texts are very different from the King James Bible, when in reality, they give convincing support for these readings as being 200 years older than the corrupt Greek copies upon which the modern versions are based...”*

*“It definitely appears Mr. Kutilek has no inspired, inerrant text to offer us and his multiple modern versions can't even agree among themselves. So he casts up vapour and smoke in an attempt to prove the King James Bible is somehow wrong and we can never really know for sure what God has said. This tactic is alarmingly similar to the one used by the serpent who asks the first question recorded in the Holy Bible - “Yea, hath God said...?”*

*“Mr. Kutilek concludes with these words [see above]: “These 26 examples gleaned practically at random from the apparatus of The Greek New Testament, 3rd edition, 1975, published by the United Bible Societies, represent only a small fraction of the Old Latin departures from the received text (as well as from the Byzantine text). Very many more could be listed, but surely these are enough to refute the false claim that the Old Latin in any of its forms is Byzantine in text type.”*

*“I seriously doubt that Doug Kutilek “gleaned practically at random” his minor selections in an effort to prove to us that the Old Latin version is not “in any of its forms a Byzantine text.” Do you really think Mr. Kutilek is an impartial judge in these matters, or does he have an agenda to promote himself as the Final Authority of what God did or did not say? Other equally qualified scholars have examined the same evidence and arrived at a very different conclusion than that of men like James White, Gary Hudson, and Doug Kutilek.”*

One of these scholars is Dr Moorman<sup>9 p 28ff</sup>. In contrast to Kutilek's sketchy analysis, Dr Moorman provides 1252 Old Latin citations of 356 doctrinal passages against the Received Text but 2340 citations *with* the Received Text or 2:1 in favour of the Received Text. Dr Moorman notes that the Vulgate of Jerome is about evenly divided in this respect. Moorman states.

*"It seems likely that the Old Latin was translated in the Syrian Antioch by missionaries going to the West. Existing manuscripts certainly show a strong Syrian and Aramaic tendency. This being the case, the Old Latin is associated with that city which is the missionary center of the Book of Acts, and had immediate concourse with those centers in Asia Minor which received the Epistles of Paul. History is so unanimous to Antioch being the fountainhead of the Traditional Text that it has been called the "Antiochan Text."*

*"The 55 or 60 OL manuscripts which remain for us today show varying amounts of corruption, and frequently disagree among themselves. As such they are but an imperfect reflection of the original OL Text. The OL of North Africa show some of the strange cases of addition and subtraction associated with the so-called Western Text, while those of Europe are generally favourable to the Traditional Text.*

*"It is the branch of the Old Latin used in northern Italy that attracts our interest most, and establishes one of the crucial chapters in Bible transmissional history. This version, known as the Itala, is associated with the Christians of the Vaudois – the valleys of northern Italy and southern France. These noble believers withstood every attempt of Rome to "bring them into the fold." From the days of Pope Sylvester (early 300's) unto the massacres of 1655, they were slaughtered, their names blackened and their records destroyed; yet they remained true to the Scriptures. They are known by a number of names, but best as the Waldensians. Research into the text and history of the Waldensian Bible has shown that it is a lineal descendent of the Old Latin Itala. In other words, the Itala has come down to us in the Waldensian form, and firmly supports the Traditional Text."*

See also remarks by Dr Ruckman and Dr Mrs Riplinger in **Chapter 4** on Matthew 20:22 and the corrupting influence of Origen and Jerome on the Old Latin.

In sum, Dr Moorman's analysis establishes that:

- The Old Latin is a distinct text from Jerome's Vulgate.
- The Old Latin predates Jerome's Vulgate. (Kutilek does not seriously address what bible the Waldensian believers possessed before the advent of Jerome's Vulgate in approximately 380 AD<sup>12 p 201</sup>. It has to have been an uncorrupted Old Latin text.)
- The uncorrupted Old Latin follows the Traditional Text of the AV1611.
- At least some Waldensian Bibles were the Old Latin type, not that of Jerome's Vulgate.

Kutilek is therefore clearly wrong in his claim *"that the Old Latin version is not "in any of its forms a Byzantine text."*" Discussion of the nature of the Waldensian Bibles follows, addressing first the Waldensian approach to Pope Alexander III.

### ***The Nature of the Waldensian Bibles***

Of the Waldensian overtures to Pope Alexander III, Dr Ruckman<sup>198 p 293</sup> notes with reference to the exhaustive church history by Philip Schaff, *"In 1179 they asked Alexander III to let them preach on the streets and even gave him a copy of their Bible which they had translated from the Old Latin of the King James Bible. They were forbidden to preach*

*and were laughed out of the council. Later their Bibles were committed to the flames and eighty of their preachers were burned at the stake in [Strasburg] in 1212.”*

Wilkinson gives a credible explanation<sup>12 p 201, 205-6, 209</sup> for the intensity of the papal reaction, with numerous references. See also remarks under *Early Conspirators and Corrupters*. This extract includes what Kutilek cited plus some crucial statements that he omitted, underlining added.

*“Some authorities speak of the Waldenses as having as their Bible, the Vulgate. We regret to dispute these claims. But when we consider that the Waldenses were, so to speak, in their mountain fastnesses, on an island in the midst of a sea of nations using the Vulgate, without doubt they knew and possessed the Vulgate; but the Italic, the earlier Latin, was their own Bible, the one for which they lived and suffered and died. Moreover, to the east was Constantinople, the center of Greek Catholicism, whose Bible was the Received Text; while a little farther east, was the noble Syrian Church which also had the Received Text. In touch with these, northern Italy could easily verify her text. It is very evident that the Latin Bible of early British Christianity [i.e. of the same lineage as the Waldensian Bibles] not only was not the Latin Bible of the Papacy, that is, the Vulgate, but it was at such variance with the Vulgate as to engender strife.*

*“The following quotation from Dr. Von Dobschutz will verify these two facts:*

*““When Pope Gregory found some Anglo-Saxon youths at the slave market of Rome and perceived that in the North there was still a pagan nation to be baptized, he sent one of his monks to England, and this monk, who was Saint Augustine, took with him the Bible and introduced it to the Anglo-Saxons, and one of his followers brought with him from Rome pictures showing the Biblical history, and decorated the walls of the church in the monastery of Wearmouth. We do not enter here into the difficult question of the relations between this newly founded Anglo-Saxon church and the old Iro-Scottish church. Differences of Bible text had something to do with the pitiful struggles which arose between the churches and ended in the devastation of the older one.””*

Wilkinson provides further evidence to illustrate the differences between the Waldensian Bibles and Jerome’s Vulgate.

*“In the fourth century, Helvidius, a great scholar of northern Italy, accused Jerome, whom the Pope had empowered to form a Bible in Latin for Catholicism, with using corrupt Greek manuscripts. How could Helvidius have accused Jerome of employing corrupt Greek MSS. if Helvidius had not had the pure Greek manuscripts? And so learned and so powerful in writing and teaching was Jovinian, the pupil of Helvidius, that it demanded three of Rome’s most famous fathers — Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose — to unite in opposing Jovinian’s influence. Even then, it needed the condemnation of the Pope and the banishment of the Emperor to prevail. But Jovinian’s followers lived on and made the way easier for Luther...”*

*“The Reformers held that the Waldensian Church was formed about 120 A.D., from which date on, they passed down from father to son the teachings they received from the apostles. The Latin Bible, the Italic, was translated from the Greek not later than 157 A.D. We are indebted to Beza, the renowned associate of Calvin, for the statement that the Italic Church dates from 120 A.D. From the illustrious group of scholars which gathered round Beza, 1590 A.D., we may understand how the Received Text was the bond of union between great historic churches. As the sixteenth century is closing, we see in the beautiful Swiss city of Geneva, Beza, an outstanding champion of Protestantism, the scholar Cyril Lucar, later to become the head of the Greek Catholic Church, and Diodati,*

*also a foremost scholar. As Beza astonishes and confounds the world by restoring manuscripts of that Greek New Testament from which the King James is translated, Diodati takes the same and translates into Italian a new and famous edition, adopted and circulated by the Waldenses.”*

The Diodati Version remains in circulation to this day and is the Italian equivalent of the AV1611. Wilkinson continues, highlighting a principle reason why the Waldensian Bible of the 16<sup>th</sup> century could not have been a direct translation of the Vulgate. This author’s emphasis.

*“At the same time another group of scholars, bitterly hostile to the first group, were gathered at Rheims, France. There the Jesuits, assisted by Rome and backed by all the power of Spain, brought forth an English translation of the Vulgate. **In its preface they expressly declared that the Vulgate had been translated in 1300 into Italian and in 1400 into French, “the sooner to shake out of the deceived people’s hands, the false heretical translations of a sect called Waldenses.”** This proves that Waldensian Versions existed in 1300 and 1400. It was the Vulgate, Rome’s corrupt Scriptures against the Received Text — the New Testament of the apostles, of the Waldenses, and of the Reformers.*

*“That Rome in early days corrupted the manuscripts while the Italic Church handed them down in their apostolic purity, Allix, the renowned scholar, testifies. He reports the following as Italic articles of faith: “They receive only, saith he, what is written in the Old and New Testament. They say, that the Popes of Rome, and other priests, have depraved the Scriptures by their doctrines and glosses.”*

*“It is recognized that the Itala was translated from the Received Text (Syrian, Hort calls it) ; that the Vulgate is the Itala with the readings of the Received Text removed.”*

It has to be remembered that not all Waldensian documents are extant, by any means. Attempts to obliterate their history, including that of their bibles, extend to comparatively recent times. Wilkinson continues.

*“It is impossible to write fully the inspiring history of this persecuted people, whose origin goes back to apostolic days and whose history is ornamented with stories of gripping interest. Rome has obliterated the records. Dr. DeSanctis, many years a Catholic official at Rome, some time official Censor of the Inquisition and later a convert to Protestantism, thus reports the conversation of a Waldensian scholar as he points out to others the ruins of Palatine Hill, Rome:*

*““‘See,’ said the Waldensian, ‘a beautiful monument of ecclesiastical antiquity. These rough materials are the ruins of the two great Palatine libraries, one Greek and the other Latin, where the precious manuscripts of our ancestors were collected, and which Pope Gregory I, called the Great, caused to be burned.’”*

*“The destruction of Waldensian records beginning about 600 A.D. by Gregory I, was carried through with thoroughness by the secret agents of the Papacy.*

*““It is a singular thing,” says Gilly, “that the destruction or rapine, which has been so fatal to Waldensian documents, should have pursued them even to the place of security, to which all, that remained, were consigned by Morland, in 1658, the library of the University of Cambridge. The most ancient of these relics were ticketed in seven packets, distinguished by letters of the alphabet, from A to G. The whole of these were missing when I made inquiry for them in 1823.””*

Wilkinson adduces more witnesses for the Old Itala Bible as following the Traditional Text instead of Jerome's Vulgate in his supplementary work<sup>230 p 241</sup> to *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*.

*"Since the Waldenses existed from the early Christian centuries, it would naturally be expected that their first Bible in their own tongue would be in Latin. Diligent research has proved that this is so. They early possessed that beautiful Latin version of the Bible called the Itala, which was translated from Greek manuscripts. This is proved by comparing the Itala version with the liturgy, or fixed form of divine service, used in the diocese of Milan for centuries, which contains many texts of Scripture from this Itala. H. J. Warner says: "The version current among the Western heretics can be shown to be based upon the Greek and not upon the Vulgate." When the fall of the Roman Empire came because of the inrush of the Teutonic peoples, the Romaunt, that beautiful speech which for centuries bridged the transition from Latin to modern Italian, had become the mother tongue of the Waldenses. They multiplied copies of the Holy Scriptures in that language for the people."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger<sup>39 p 962, 966-8, 982-3</sup> has these comments with respect to the Old Itala and Waldensian Bibles. Emphases are hers. See also **Chapter 4**.

*"The Old Itala Bible, dating back to the time of the apostles, matches Erasmus' Greek New Testament and the King James Bible. (This author collated them.) Even Augustine in his fourth century writing, De doctrina Christiana, admitted that 'in the early centuries of the church, a very great number of Latin' [pre-Jerome] Bibles were available, saying "Now among the translations themselves the Italian (Itala) is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice."*

*"Erasmus wrote in his Preface that he consulted, not the Latin Vulgate, but these ancient Italic Bibles..."*

*"Jerome corrupted [the] pure Old Itala Bible in the fourth century. He admitted in his Preface. "You [Pope Damasus] urge me to revise the Old Latin and, as it were, to sit in judgment on the copies of Scriptures which are now scattered throughout the world...Is there not a man, learned or unlearned, who will not, when he takes the volume in hand...call me a forger and a profane person for having had the audacity to add anything to the ancient books, or to make changes..." In Jerome's Prologue to the Catholic Epistles, "Preserved in the Codex Fuldensis"...he admits that Christians "have pronounced to have me branded a falsifier and a corrupter of the Sacred Scriptures"...Even Metzger [whom Kutilek quotes as declaring the Old Latin as effectively an Alexandrian text] admits, "Jerome's apprehension that he would be castigated for tampering with the Holy Writ was not unfounded. His revision of the Latin Bible provoked both criticism and anger, sometimes with extraordinary vehemence.""*

*"When Erasmus was in Italy he would have seen, not only the ancient pure Old Itala manuscripts, but the Italian Bibles of his day, as well. These Italian Bibles did not match the corrupt Latin Vulgate of Jerome, according to Samuel Berger, who has done **the** definitive work on the history of the Italian translations. [Citing the Cambridge History of the Bible] "Berger's general conclusion was that Italian translators depended in large measure on previous French and Provincial versions...before the mid-thirteenth century and representing, in part at least, **non-Vulgate** versions...These conclusions have been accepted in the main...The formation of the Italian Bible was influenced by transalpine versions...It is probable...that the first Italian versions were the work of Waldensian(s)..."*

*“Today we have copies of Italian Bibles that would have been very familiar to Erasmus: the Tuscan version of the 1200s, a Venetian dialect Bible of the 1300s, the Riccardiani Bible of 1252, the Malermi Bible of 1420, and the Jenson Italian Bible. Erasmus would have had no problem determining what readings were accepted by the **real** body of Christ in Italy”...*

*“Jacques LeLong states that even in the editions of 1170 and 1180, the [Old] French Bible follows the readings of the Christian Waldenses, not the Catholic edition...”*

*“Today there are six remaining copies of the 1180 edition of the French Provençal (Romaunt) version of the Bible. This language was spoken in the south of Europe between the 9<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. It carried forward the pure old Itala Bibles of the Waldenses.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger cites both Gilly and Wylie (who quotes Gilly), as Kutilek does, but without detailed quotes from either historian. Some elaboration is useful, therefore.

Wylie’s<sup>231 p 12-13</sup> main source of information on the Medieval Waldensian Romaunt Version appears to be Gilly<sup>232 p xcix-cv</sup>. Some Romaunt readings in John’s Gospel do match the Vulgate against the AV1611. For example, inspection of John 4:42, 5:16 shows that the Romaunt Version omits the AV1611 readings **“the Christ”** and **“and sought to slay him”** as does Jerome’s Vulgate<sup>142</sup> but so do the majority of the extant Old Latin witnesses<sup>9 p 102</sup>, 4 in favour of the AV1611 in John 4:42, 5 against, 3 in favour, 6 against in John 5:16. This result suggests that the Romaunt Version suffered from impure sources, at least in John’s Gospel. Such a possibility is one way of viewing Gilly’s statement<sup>232 p xcix</sup> that Kutilek partially quotes, *“The Romaunt Version...contains proof that its compilers, at the the same time that they used the Vulgate of Jerome for their text, did not adhere to it servilely, but consulted the remains of the old “Versio Itala,” and adopted the readings of that version, whenever they saw reason to prefer them to those of Jerome.”*

*“The remains of the old “Versio Itala” would have to have been the old Itala Version that Wilkinson and others, Dr Moorman, Dr Mrs Riplinger, have referred to. Its text was clearly different from that of Jerome. It would be most enlightening to know the full extent of these differences, especially insofar as Dr Mrs Riplinger states above that “Jerome corrupted [the] pure Old Itala Bible in the fourth century.”*

But this result, from Gilly himself, casts further doubt on Kutilek’s notion of *“the false claim that the Old Latin in any of its forms is Byzantine in text type,”* given that *“the old “Versio Itala”*” had to come from the Old Latin.

Gilly<sup>232 p c</sup> then lists the non-Vulgate Latin sources (and Graeco-Latin Codex Beza source to which the Romaunt translators also had access) for a total of 27 departures from Jerome’s Vulgate by the Romaunt Version in John’s Gospel. Kutilek states with respect to this section of Gilly’s study *“he points out that that Vulgate text was of an occasionally mixed character”* and using Gilly’s notes at the end of the Romaunt Gospel of John, Kutilek declares that *“these Old Latin manuscript agreements with the Roumant [Romaunt] against the Vulgate are nearly always exceedingly minute.”* See above.

However, Kutilek only refers to 15 of the 27 departures to which Gilly refers and Gilly, in this section of his work, does not, contrary to what Kutilek implies, make reference to a mixed Vulgate text. Neither does he dismiss all of the 27 departures as *“exceedingly minute.”* Instead, Gilly states of these differences *“These are indications, not to be lightly esteemed, of anxious discrimination on the part of the translators of the Romaunt Version, who, like the translators of our own Authorized Version, omitted no opportunity of comparing their own work with the various texts, and interpretations of the original, within their reach.”*



Gilly's comments give a different impression from the one Kutilek is trying to convey. It may have been that Jerome's Vulgate was the most complete source that the Romaunt translators had but they nevertheless did what they could to achieve a pure text and did not trust Jerome's Vulgate implicitly.

As Wilkinson notes<sup>12 p 201, 220</sup> *“For nine hundred years, we are told, the first Latin translations held their own after the Vulgate appeared. The Vulgate was born about 380 A.D. Nine hundred years later brings us to about 1280 A.D. This accords well with the fact that at the famous Council of Toulouse, 1229 A.D., the Pope gave orders for the most terrible crusade to be waged against the simple Christians of southern France and northern Italy who would not bow to his power. Cruel, relentless, devastating, this war was waged, destroying the Bibles, books, and every vestige of documents to tell the story of the Waldenses and Albigenses...”*

*“Although endorsed and supported by the power of the Papacy, the Vulgate — which name we will now call Jerome's translation — did not gain everywhere immediate acceptance. It took nine hundred years to bring that about. Purer Latin Bibles than it had already a deep place in the affections of the West...”*

It is possible that by the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, when the Romaunt Version appeared, Jerome's Vulgate could have been the most readily available text but later Waldensian translators would continue the work of the Romaunt translators in seeking to achieve a pure text, as will be shown.

Overall inspection of John's Gospel in the Romaunt Version together with Dr Moorman's<sup>9 p 100-111</sup> comparison nevertheless shows that of the 40 passages in John that Moorman lists, consisting of 53 verses, the Romaunt Version supports the AV1611 in 30 of those passages, or 43 verses, giving 75% and 80% agreement respectively with the AV1611, or 3:1 and 4:1 respectively. Note that these levels of agreement with the AV1611 are high compared to the Old Latin and the Vulgate as a whole, which as Moorman has shown, are 2:1 and 1:1 respectively.

The 10 passages in which the Old Latin, the Vulgate (which generally depart together from the AV1611 in John) and the Romaunt depart from the AV1611 readings are John 1:51, 4:42, 5:16, 30, 8:28, 29, 59, 14:28, 16:10, 17:17. The Romaunt sides with the AV1611 with partial Old Latin and partial Vulgate support in 5 passages that Moorman lists, John 3:2, 5:3-4\*, 8:38, 13:3, 14:17, i.e. 6 verses. \*The Romaunt has “*angel of the Lord*” in John 5:4, instead of “*angel.*” Lachmann has this addition<sup>62</sup>.

Overall, it would appear that the Waldensian Romaunt translation, at least in John's Gospel, is more “*Byzantine,*” i.e. AV1611, than not and in key doctrinal passages that Moorman selects, affinities with the Vulgate notwithstanding.

It should be remembered that the NIV, representing the Westcott-Hort or Nestle-UBS Alexandrian text that Kutilek prefers – see his opinion in the previous chapter on what text Erasmus would supposedly choose if he “*were alive today*” – disputes *all* of these 40 passages in John's Gospel, occasionally in its footnotes but overwhelmingly in its *text*.

Moreover, even with Vulgate affinity, the Romaunt repeatedly agrees with the AV1611 in verses in John's Gospel that James White<sup>3 Chapter 7, Part Two</sup> disputes; John 3:13, 5:4, 6:47, 7:8, 7:53-8:11, 9:35, 17 verses in total. Kutilek did not see fit to acknowledge these pro-AV1611 aspects of the Romaunt Version.

Gilly maintains, however, in contrast to Schaff and Wilkinson, that, his emphases, “[Romaunt] Books of Scripture in a venacular tongue were presented to Pope Alexander III., under the conviction that they contained faithful translations...

“Even the version circulated in the diocese of Metz, concerning which jealous enquiry was made by Pope Innocent III., was not pronounced to be an erroneous translation; nor did the prohibitions of the Council of Toulouse, and of James King of Arragon, declare the Romaunt versions, which they forbade the laity to read, to be **unfaithful** texts.

“Those vernacular translations were condemned, not because they were false, **but because they were vernacular**; and it was the object of the hierarchy to check the spirit of scriptural inquiry, which was spreading among the people. The versions contained in this volume [i.e. Gilly’s] will be scrutinized with more than common attention, if the reader can persuade himself that he has a [Romaunt] translation before him which was prohibited in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, for no intrinsic demerit, but solely because it was in the vulgar tongue – “in a tongue understood of the people.””

At present, this discrepancy cannot be fully resolved. The Romaunt Version was possibly an attempt at a compromise to enable the Waldensians to encourage “*the spirit of scriptural inquiry*” to which Gilly refers. If so, the compromise failed disastrously, because, for whatever reason, the pope condemned the Romaunt versions.

Cloud’s comments<sup>6</sup> with respect to White’s book are instructive and apply equally to Kutilek’s opinion of the Waldensian bibles. Cloud’s analysis utilises Nolan’s work and differs from Gilly’s. Underline emphases are this author’s.

“WHITE IGNORES THE TEXTUAL TRADITION THAT PRECEDED THE ADOPTION OF THE RECEIVED TEXT IN THE 1500S.

“White ignores the old Latin tradition, which had a wide influence separate from and alongside the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate. He ignores the Waldensian Romaunt translations and other translations that followed a textual stream akin to the Received Text and distinct from the modern critical text.

“In his diligent research into the early history of the Bible in the first few centuries following the Apostles, and into the Waldensian Romaunt and the old Latin, Frederick Nolan (1784-1864) concluded that the critical variations from the Received Text which were being introduced in his day (and which are found in modern Bibles) were reflections of textual corruptions introduced by Origen and Eusebius of [Caesarea] and other heretical editors during the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries. Dr. Nolan concluded that the Received Text underlying the old Protestant Bibles (such as the English Authorized Version) is the text of the Apostles, and that the key omissions (such as those in Mark 16:9-20; Acts 20:28, 1 Timothy 3:16) found in the modern versions were introduced by heretics of the second and third centuries, or by those who were attempting to oppose the heretics.

“Nolan found evidence that the early Latin version called the Italick or old Latin was produced by Bible-believing Christians who were separate from Rome and its growing apostasy, and this biblical witness continued to be maintained in translations made by the Waldenses. The Waldensians, in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, raised the funds to publish the Olivetan French Received Text Bible, because they recognized that the text underlying it (the same text as that used by Luther for German and Tyndale for English) was the one they had used for centuries in the translations which were sought out and destroyed by the Roman Catholic authorities. We have documented this history in our book *Rome and the Bible: Tracing the History of the Roman Catholic Church and Its Persecution of the Bible and of*

*Bible Believers and also in our book For Love of the Bible (Way of Life Literature, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277)."*

Actual Waldensian documents in support of Cloud's analysis above are, regrettably, scarce (no doubt for the reasons given above). Cloud states from his own\* observations<sup>233</sup> that "*Textually, the two Waldensian Bibles that I have examined so far follow the Latin New Testament. For example, they omit the word "God" in 1 Timothy 3:16 but contain the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7.*"

\*Dr Cloud has since stated to me in an email reply that these two bibles appear to have been based on Jerome's Vulgate, which would indicate that they were copies of the Romaunt Version.

However, these cannot have been the only bibles available to the Waldensians because Dr Mrs Riplinger states<sup>14, p 353</sup> that the Diodati Version – see above - *does* attest to "**God was manifest in the flesh,**" in 1 Timothy 3:16.

Wilkinson<sup>12 p 209ff</sup> is able to trace many bibles of the Reformation back to Waldensian roots. The combined testimony of these bibles is a strong counter to Kutilek's notion that all Waldensian bibles were "*Vulgate-based.*"

#### **"Waldensian Bibles**

*"Four Bibles produced under Waldensian influence touched the history of Calvin: namely, a Greek, a Waldensian vernacular, a French, and an Italian. Calvin himself was led to his great work by Olivetan, a Waldensian. Thus was the Reformation brought to Calvin, that brilliant student of the Paris University...*

*"Finally, persecution at Paris and the solicitation of Farel caused Calvin to settle at Geneva, where, with Beza, he brought out an edition of the Textus Receptus, — the one the author now uses in his college class rooms, as edited by Scrivener. Of Beza, Dr. Edgar says that he "astonished and confounded the world" with the Greek manuscripts he unearthed. This later edition of the Received Text is in reality a Greek New Testament brought out under Waldensian influence. Unquestionably, the leaders of the Reformation, German, French, and English, were convinced that the Received Text was the genuine New Testament, not only by its own irresistible history and internal evidence, but also because it matched with the Received Text which in Waldensian form came down from the days of the apostles.*

*"The other three Bibles of Waldensian connection were due to three men who were at Geneva with Calvin, or, when he died, with Beza, his successor, namely, Olivetan, Leger, and Diodati. How readily the two streams of descent of the Received Text, through the Greek East and the Waldensian West, ran together, is illustrated by the meeting of the Olivetan Bible and the Received Text. Olivetan, one of the most illustrious pastors of the Waldensian Valleys, a relative of Calvin, according to Leger, and a splendid student, translated the New Testament into French. Leger bore testimony that the Olivetan Bible, which accorded with the Textus Receptus, was unlike the old manuscripts of the Papists, because they were full of falsification. Later, Calvin edited a second edition of the Olivetan Bible. The Olivetan in turn became the basis of the Geneva Bible in English, which was the leading version in England in 1611 when the King James appeared.*

*"Diodati, who succeeded Beza in the chair of Theology at Geneva, translated the Received Text into Italian. This version was adopted by the Waldenses, although there was in use at that time a Waldensian Bible in their own peculiar language [i.e. a Romaunt-type Version]. This we know because Sir Samuel Morland, under the protection of Oliver*

*Cromwell, received from Leger the Waldensian New Testament which now lies in Cambridge University library. After the devastating massacre of the Waldenses in 1655, Leger felt that he should collect and give into the hands of Sir Samuel Morland as many pieces of the ancient Waldensian literature as were available.”*

It is very significant that the Waldensians adopted Diodati’s Bible. This suggests that the Waldensians had the means to determine that Diodati’s Text was superior to that, say, of the Romaunt Version – i.e. Diodati was closer to the Old Itala. Wilkinson continues.

*“It is interesting to trace back the Waldensian Bible which Luther had before him when he translated the New Testament. Luther used the Tepl Bible, named from Tepl, Bohemia. This Tepl manuscript represented a translation of the Waldensian Bible into the German which was spoken before the days of the Reformation. Of this remarkable manuscript, Comba says:*

*““When the manuscript of Tepl appeared, the attention of the learned was aroused by the fact that the text it presents corresponds word for word with that of the first three editions of the ancient German Bible. Then Louis Keller, an original writer, with the decided opinions of a layman and versed in the history of the sects of the Middle Ages, declared the Tepl manuscript to be Waldensian. Another writer, Hermann Haupt, who belongs to the old Catholic party, supported his opinion vigorously.”*

*“From Comba we also learn that the Tepl manuscript has an origin different from the version adopted by the Church of Rome; that it seems to agree rather with the Latin versions anterior to Jerome, the author of the Vulgate; and that Luther followed it in his translation, which probably is the reason why the Catholic Church reproved Luther for following the Waldenses. Another peculiarity is its small size, which seems to single it out as one of those little books which the Waldensian evangelists carried with them hidden under their rough cloaks. We have, therefore, an indication of how much the Reformation under Luther as well as Luther’s Bible owed to the Waldenses.*

*“Waldensian influence, both from the Waldensian Bibles and from Waldensian relationships, entered into the King James translation of 1611. Referring to the King James translators, one author speaks thus of a Waldensian Bible they used:*

*““It is known that among modern versions they consulted was an Italian, and though no name is mentioned, there cannot be room for doubt that it was the elegant translation made with great ability from the original Scriptures by Giovanni Diodati, which had only recently (1607) appeared at Geneva.”*

*“It is therefore evident that the translators of 1611 had before them four Bibles which had come under Waldensian influence: the Diodati in Italian, the Olivetan in French, the Lutheran in German, and the Genevan in English. We have every reason to believe that they had access to at least six Waldensian Bibles written in the old Waldensian vernacular.*

*“Dr. Nolan, who had already acquired fame for his Greek and Latin scholarship, and researches into Egyptian chronology, and was a lecturer of note, spent twenty-eight years to trace back the Received Text to its apostolic origin. He was powerfully impressed to examine the history of the Waldensian Bible. He felt certain that researches in this direction would demonstrate that the Italic New Testament, or the New Testament of those primitive Christians of northern Italy whose lineal descendants the Waldenses were, would turn out to be the Received Text. He says:*

““The author perceived, without any labor of inquiry, that it derived its name from that diocese, which has been termed the *Italick*, as contradistinguished from the Roman. This is a supposition, which receives a sufficient confirmation from the fact, — that the principal copies of that version have been preserved in that diocese, the metropolitan church of which was situated in Milan. The circumstance is at present mentioned, as the author thence formed a hope, that some remains of the primitive *Italick* version might be found in the early translations made by the Waldenses, who were the lineal descendants of the *Italick* Church; and who have asserted their independence against the usurpation of the Church of Rome, and have ever enjoyed the free use of the Scriptures. In the search to which these considerations have led the author, his fondest expectations have been fully realized. It has furnished him with abundant proof on that point to which his inquiry was chiefly directed; as it has supplied him with the unequivocal testimony of a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church, that the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses [1 John 5:7] was adopted in the version which prevailed in the Latin Church, previously to the introduction of the modern *Vulgate*”” i.e. Jerome’s *Vulgate* simply retained 1 John 5:7, showing the verse to be of apostolic origin and thus favourably influencing the King James translators.

Wilkinson<sup>209</sup> Section III addressed the nature of the Waldensian Bibles in detail in his response to the initial criticisms of *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. Note that Wilkinson’s comments largely address the earlier Waldensian translations, or ““*Versio Itala*,”” not the Romaunt Version. His statements below, adducing numerous distinguished references, clearly counter Kutilek’s opinion on the Waldensian bibles.

It would appear appropriate to let Wilkinson have the last word. Readers may decide on the true nature of the Waldensian bibles for themselves from what has been given and from what follows. This author’s conclusion is that Wilkinson is essentially correct in his evaluation of the Waldensian bibles (stemming originally from the ““*Versio Itala*””) and that Kutilek is wrong. Remember that Kutilek’s assertions about the Old Latin have been refuted by Kinney. Remember too that Kutilek’s opinion of the Waldensian bibles as “*Vulgate-based*” stems only from his consideration of the Romaunt John’s Gospel, which he neglects to mention is – even if also in agreement with Jerome’s *Vulgate* - 75-80% in agreement with the AV1611 in 40 key passages *against* the text of the NIV, Nestle-UBS, Westcott and Hort and Alexandria that Kutilek prefers.

Wilkinson’s comments on the Waldensian bibles that this author has used extensively earlier in this work would therefore appear to have been vindicated.

Wilkinson states as follows, his underlinings. His analysis concludes this chapter.

*“From Dr Kenyon, “Our Bible and Ancient MSS”,*

*““The Italian Text being evidently due to a revision of those with the help of Greek copies of a Syrian type.” Ibid. p. 169...*

*“Note Dr. Kenyon’s remarkable statement to the effect that the Italian text was the revision with the help of Greek copies of a Syrian type. Since Dr. Kenyon had adopted Hort’s word “Syrian” to mean the Textus Receptus, here we have positive evidence that the Itala or the Italic type of Latin manuscript was of the Textus Receptus type. It is this Itala which Dr. Nolan proves was the Bible of the Waldenses. Moreover, Dr. Kenyon specifically names the Codex Brixianus, as does Dr. Nolan. Thus we have the testimony of Dr. Nolan, Dr. Kenyon, also Burgon and Miller, to the effect that the Codex Brixianus is of the type of the Textus Receptus...*

*“My Reviewers used a quotation from the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia in their effort to prove that the Itala was the Vulgate, (Sec. I, page 16). They overlooked a paragraph preceding, which demolishes their theory or rather Cardinal Wiseman’s theory... when they say that the Old Latin manuscripts were of African origin. I will now quote the paragraph, which my Reviewers overlooked:*

*“Although the evidence has, up to the present time, been regarded as favoring the African origin of the first Latin translation of the Bible, recent investigation into what is called the Western Text of the N.T. has yielded results pointing elsewhere. It is clear from a comparison that the Western type of text has close affinity with the Syrian witnesses originating in the Eastern provinces of the Empire. The close textual relation disclosed between the Latin and the Syrian versions has led some authorities to believe that, after all, the earliest Latin version may have been made in the East, and possibly at Antioch.” “International S.B. Encyclopedia.” Vol. III, p. 1842. (Emphasis mine)*

*“It is interesting to note that the quotation which they did use from this same Encyclopedia, and which followed (the former paragraph preceded) the above quotation, was an effort on their part to prove that the Itala was the Vulgate. (This was on page 16, Section I.) However, on page 15, section I, they used another quotation (from Scrivener) to prove that the Itala was a stepping stone to the Vulgate. Now will my Reviewers please tell us which of the two they meant it to be, the Vulgate, or a stepping stone to the Vulgate? It can’t be both. They have delivered to us here contradictory testimony.*

*“In their endeavor to disprove the Itala as a text of the Textus Receptus type they bring quotations to show that it was a stepping stone to the Vulgate. I cannot see what bearing this has on the situation. Suppose Jerome did use the Old Latin getting out his Vulgate. In fact we know he did use it. But the Old Latin still persisted after the Vulgate was made even until the 12th and 13th centuries. So all quotations about the Old Latin being a stepping stone to the Vulgate are beside the point.*

*“Why did my Reviewers say (Section I, p. 16): “Waldenses had only the Vulgate.” I take issue with this statement, when the Spirit of Prophecy shows that the Vulgate contained many errors (Great Controversy, p. 245), and also declared that the Waldensian Bible was preserved uncorrupted. (Great Controversy, p. 65) The evidence is clear that the true Waldensian Bible was not the Vulgate. Of course they had access to the Vulgate as we Protestants today also have, but it was not their own proper Bible. Dr. Schaff says: “This high place the Vulgate holds even to this day in the Roman Church, where it is unwarrantably and perniciously placed on an equality with the original.” Do not accuse the Waldenses of this “unwarranted” and “Pernicious” doing. (McClintock and Strong, Art. Jerome.)...*

*“All the forgoing arguments may be found in my book summed up in one paragraph which my Reviewers did not notice, much less attempt to answer. This paragraph reads, (O. A. B. V. p. 37)*

*““It is recognized that the Itala was translated from the Received Text (Syrian Hort calls it); that the Vulgate is the Itala with the readings of the Received Text removed.”*

*“Of course this means the variant readings removed. Why did Jerome remove the Textus Receptus variant readings from the Itala, if the Itala and the Vulgate were the same? See also article on Jerome in McClintock and Strong’s Encyclopedia which shows that Jerome in getting out the Vulgate, departed widely from the “traditional text” (i.e. Textus Receptus), “the only text which was known” to those who resisted Jerome’s innovations. If Helvidius, Jovinian and Vigilantus (reputed founder of the Waldenses) were fighting*

*Jerome, it was not likely they would accept his Bible, edited under the flatteries of the Pope...*

*“Dr. Jacobus says:*

*“The old Latin versions were used longest by the Western Christians who would not bow to the authority of Rome.” “Bible Versions Compared.” Appendix, Note 15*

*“This quotation proves that several bodies of Western European Christians for 900 years refused the Vulgate and clung to the Old Latin Bible. The Reformers also recognized the thousands of errors in the Vulgate. It was impossible therefore for the Waldenses as one of those Christian bodies opposed to Rome to do otherwise than refuse to accept the Vulgate.*

*“I wish here also to emphasize the difference between the older Romaunt language and the later. Confusion may arise unless we emphasize the splendid tongue of the early Waldenses stretching from the year 400 on in comparison with that used by Waldo about the year 1200, when he and his followers added themselves to the ancient Waldenses.*

*“Just here I give a quotation to show the great influence the Waldenses had upon the Reformation:*

*““Seemingly they took no share in the great struggle which was going on around them in all parts of Europe, but in reality they were exercising a powerful influence upon the world. Their missionaries were everywhere, proclaiming the simple truths of Christianity, and stirring the hearts of men to their very depths. In Hungary, in Bohemia, in France, in England, in Scotland, as well as Italy, they were working with tremendous, though silent power. Lollard, who paved the way for Wycliffe in England, was a missionary from these Valleys. The Albigenses, whose struggle with Rome forms one of the most touching episodes of history, owed their knowledge of the truth to the Vaudois missions. In Germany and Bohemia the Vaudois teachings heralded, if they did not hasten, the Reformation, and Huss and Jerome, Luther and Calvin did little more than carry on the work begun by the Vaudois missionaries.” McCabe, “Cross and Crown”, p. 32.*

*“We have proved before that the Old Latin Bible for 900 years resisted the Vulgate and persisted in the hands of those who never bowed the knee to Rome. We will now bring you up to the time of the Reformation, or the 13th century. Did the Waldenses then accept the Vulgate? No indeed.*

*“When the early leaders of the Reformation came, by invitation, into the valleys of the Waldenses, to meet their assembled delegates from all over Europe, they saw in the hands of their learned pastors, what, - the Vulgate? No! They saw manuscripts going back to “time out of mind” in the ancient and not the modern, Romaunt language\*. By agreement between the Waldenses and the Reformers, these manuscripts were translated into French, compared with the original Hebrew and Greek, and became the Olivetan Bible, the first Protestant Bible in the French language, Olivetan came with Farel, the leading Reformer to this council of the Waldensian churches. The second edition of the Olivetan Bible produced by Calvin, became the basis of the Geneva Bible in English. The Geneva Bible was a foundation and forerunner of the King James. Is not the chain now complete, and is it not now clear that our Authorized Version is the Bible of the Apostles coming down through the noble Waldenses? Let me give you an authoritative quotation on these facts:*

*““The Reformers,’ says one who was present at the meeting, ‘were greatly rejoiced to see that people, who had ever proved faithful, the Israel of the Alps, to whose charge God*

had committed for so many centuries the Ark of the New Covenant - thus eager in his service. And examining with interest,' says he, 'the manuscript copies of the Old and New Testaments in the vulgar tongue which were amongst us'...It will be perceived that it is a Vaudois who speaks... 'correctly copied with the hand at a date beyond all memory, they marveled at that favour of Heaven which a people so small in numbers had enjoyed, and rendered thanks to the Lord that the Bible had never been taken from them. Then, also, in their great desire that the reading of it might be made profitable to a greater number of persons, they adjured all the other brethren, for the glory of God and the good of Christians, to take measures for circulating it, showing how necessary it was that a general translation should be made of it into French, carefully compared with the original texts and of which large numbers would be printed.'" Musten, "Israel of the Alps," Vol. I, p. 97."

\*Thus it appears that more than one Romaunt Version existed. Wilkinson continues.

"I quote another account of this event from McCabe, "Cross and Crown."

"Thus the time passed on until the Reformation dawned upon the world. The Vaudois were well pleased at this general awakening of the human mind. They entered into correspondence with the Reformers in various parts of Europe, and sent several of their Barbas [scholars (?)] to them to instruct them. The Reformers on their part, admitted the antiquity of the Vaudois rites and the purity of their faith, and treated the mountain Church with the greatest respect. On the 12th of September, 1532, a Synodal Assembly was held at Angrogna. It was attended by a number of deputies from the Reformed Churches in France and Switzerland. Among them was William Farrel, of France, to whom we shall refer again in another part of this work. He manifested the greatest interest in the manuscript copies of the Bible which the Vaudois had preserved from the earliest times, and at his instance the entire Bible was translated into French, and sent as a free gift from the Vaudois to the French." page 37.

"I have given all this practically in my book. To be sure, I do not use the same authors and the same quotations, but I give the same history and results. In the quotation I give in my book (page 32) from Leger he contrasted this Olivetan French Bible of 1535 (or 1537) with the manuscripts formerly found among the papists, which he said "were full of falsifications."

"Recall that about forty years after this, the learned fathers of the Council of Trent, upon the recommendation of Gregory XIII in 1578, made a study of all the Greek MSS in the libraries of Italy for one MS with which to defend the Vulgate and they chose the Vaticanus M.S. Nevertheless, forty years previous the Waldenses declared that the MSS found among the papists were full of falsifications.

"It will be interesting to listen to another account of this meeting of the Reformers with the Waldenses, as taken from the Life of William Farel by Bevan, (written in French):

"During the remainder of his visit in the valley of Angrogna, Farel had interesting interviews with the pastors and the villagers. They showed him their old manuscripts; some of these they said dated back 400 years in the past. The Vaudois preserved them as precious treasures from father to son; these books were very rare, were all which they possessed in the nature of religious readings. There were among those manuscripts, ancient Bibles, copied with care in the old French. While, in the so-called Christian countries, the Word of God had become an unknown book, these mountaineers possessed it and read it from generation to generation."...Bevan, "Life of Wm. Farel," p. 207 (Translated by B. G. Wilkinson.)



*“Gilly, Leger, and Muston were put in the Index. (Muston 11:400).*

*“If then, as Muston said, this Bible had never been taken from the Waldenses, and they claim in the preface to this Olivetan Bible that they had always enjoyed the free use of the Holy Scriptures since the days of the Apostles, it follows that our Authorized Version passed straight in a clear line back through the Waldenses to the days of the Apostles.*

*“Please note again the quotation I have already given that “In the very earliest times translations must have been made from Aramaic or Syriac into Latin, as afterwards from Greek. Thus a connection between the Italian and Syriac churches, and also between the teaching given in the two countries, must have lain embedded in the foundations of their common Christianity, and must have exercised an influence during very many years after.” Burgon and Miller, “Traditional Text”, p. 145.”*

## Appendix

Table A1

## AV1611 vs. Modern Readings, Cited in The King James Only Controversy

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Gen. 36:24	106	<b>mules</b>	hot springs	hot springs*	hot springs
Gen. 50:20	230	<b>thought</b>	intended	planned#	in mind
Lev. 14:10	235	<b>meat</b>	grain	oblation	grain
Joshua 15:3	235	<b>fetch a compass</b>	curved around	turned to	went around
1 Sam. 2:25	106	<b>the judge</b>	God	God*	God
1 Sam. 10:24	232	<b>God save the king</b>	Long live the king	Long live the king#	Let the king live
1 Sam. 17:6	235	<b>target of brass</b>	brass javelin	brass javelin#	javelin of copper
1 Sam. 27:10	235	<b>made a road</b>	go raiding	go raiding	made a raid
2 Sam. 14:20	235	<b>To fetch about this form of speech</b>	change the present situation	disguise the matter#	altering the face of the matter
1 Ki. 10:28	228	<b>linen yarn...linen yarn</b>	Kue...Kue	Cilicia... Cilicia* (DR has Coa...Coa)	OMIT, horse drove
2 Ki. 3:9	235	<b>fetch a compass</b>	roundabout march	a devious route#	going their way around
1 Chron. 5:26	228	<b>and the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser</b>	that is, Tiglath-Pileser	and of Tiglathpileser#	even the spirit of Tilgath-pilne-ser
Ps. 8:5	142	<b>the angels</b>	the heavenly beings	a god#	godlike ones
Ps. 12:6-7	6, 243	<b>Thou shalt keep them...preserve them</b>	you will keep us safe and protect us	Hold us in your keeping... protect us always*	You yourself...will guard them, you will preserve each one
Song 2:12	235	<b>turtle</b>	doves	turtledove#	turtledove

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Isa. 7:14	216-17, 221	<b>a virgin</b>	The virgin	the maiden#	the maiden
Isa. 14:12	138-9	<b>O Lucifer</b>	O morning star	Daystar#	you shining one
Isa. 19:10	107	<b>sluices and ponds for fish</b>	wage earners...sick at heart	workmen dejected#	wage workers grieved in soul
Isa. 26:3	98	<b>mind is stayed on thee</b>	mind is steadfast	mind is steadfast, DR peace	inclination that is well supported
Isa. 65:11	227	<b>that troop...unto that number</b>	Fortune...Destiny	Gad...Meni, DR fortune...upon it	god of Good Luck...god of Destiny
Hos. 13:9	107	<b>thou hast destroyed thyself</b>	I will destroy you	I mean to destroy you#	It will certainly bring you to ruin
Amos 4:4	25, 232	<b>your tithes after three years</b>	your tithes every three years	your tithes on the third day, DR tithes in three days	on the third day, your tenth parts
Mic. 5:2	214-15	<b>goings forth</b>	origins	origin#	origin
Mal. 2:12	107	<b>the master and the scholar</b>	whoever he may be	whoever he be#	one who is awake and one who is answering
Matt. 1:25	157-9, 216-18	<b>firstborn</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 4:18	45, 194	<b>Jesus</b>	Jesus	He#	He
Matt. 6:13	252-3	<b>For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Matt. 8:29	157, 223	<b>Jesus</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 12:25	45, 194	<b>Jesus</b>	Jesus	He#	He

<b>Verse</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>AV1611</b>	<b>NIV</b>	<b>JB</b>	<b>NWT</b>
Matt. 12:32	135-6	<b>world</b>	age	world#	System of things
Matt. 15:8	163-4	<b>draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Matt. 16:20	165	<b>Jesus</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 17:20	165	<b>unbelief</b>	little faith	little faith#	little faith
Matt. 17:21	155, 189	<b>Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 18:11	iv, 155, 189	<b>For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 19:17a	254	<b>Why callest thou me good?</b>	Why do you ask me about what is good?	Why do you ask me about what is good?*	Why do you ask me about what is good?
Matt. 19:17b	254	<b>that is, God</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 19:18	229	<b>Thou shalt do no murder</b>	Do not murder	You must not kill#	You must not murder
Matt. 20:16	157	<b>for many be called, but few chosen</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 20:22	59	<b>and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Matt. 21:12	166	<b>of God</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Matt. 23:14	155, 189	<b>Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation</b>	OMIT	OMIT, DR, JR Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: because you devour the houses of widows, praying long prayers. For this you shall receive the greater judgment	OMIT
Matt. 25:13	157	<b>wherein the Son of man cometh</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Matt. 27:35	157-8	<b>that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Matt. 28:20	135-6	<b>world</b>	age	time#	system of things
Mark 1:1	209	<b>the Son of God</b>	the Son of God	the Son of God#	OMIT
Mark 1:2	166-8	<b>the prophets</b>	Isaiah the prophet	the prophet Isaiah*	Isaiah the prophet
Mark 1:3	254-5	<b>Ye</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 1:24	253	<b>Saying, Let us alone, thou, thee</b>	OMIT	OMIT*, DR, JR include 'saying'	OMIT 'Let us alone,' changes 'thee' to 'exactly'
Mark 2:15	45, 194	<b>Jesus</b>	OMIT	Jesus, DR, JR omit 'Jesus'	OMIT
Mark 4:9	155	<b>unto them</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Mark 6:11	158	<b>Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrhah in the day of judgment, than for that city</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Mark 6:20	224	<b>observed him</b>	protected him	gave him his protection*	keeping him safe
Mark 7:16	155, 189	<b>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear</b>	OMIT	If anyone has ears to hear, let him listen to this#	OMIT
Mark 9:18	225	<b>pineth away</b>	becomes rigid	goes rigid#	loses his strength
Mark 9:29	155	<b>and fasting</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 9:44, 46	155	<b>Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 10:21	158-62, 166	<b>take up the cross</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Mark 10:24	168	<b>for them that trust in riches</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 10:30	135	<b>world</b>	age	world#	system of things
Mark 10:52	45, 195	<b>Jesus</b>	Jesus	him*	him
Mark 11:26	155	<b>But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Mark 15:28	155	<b>And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 16:9-20	150, 255-7	<b>Now when Jesus...with signs following. Amen</b>	NIV inserts 'The most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20'	JB has a footnote that 'Many MSS omit vv. 9-20' #	NWT inserts passage in smaller type with heading Long Conclusion
Luke 2:14	63, 169	<b>on earth peace, good will toward men</b>	on earth peace to men on whom his favour rests	peace to men who enjoy his favour*. DR, JR men of good will	upon earth peace among men of good will
Luke 2:22	68, 88	<b>her purification</b>	their purification	them to be purified#	purifying them
Luke 2:33	216-18	<b>Joseph</b>	the child's father	the child's father*	its father
Luke 3:14	145-6	<b>Do violence to no man</b>	Don't extort money	No intimidation! No extortion!#	Do not harass anybody
Luke 4:34	253	<b>Saying, Let us alone, thou, thee</b>	OMIT	OMIT#, DR, JR omit 'thou'	OMIT, changes 'thee' to 'exactly'
Luke 9:35	163, 210-11	<b>beloved</b>	chosen	Chosen One#	the one that has been chosen
Luke 9:44	24	<b>sink down into your ears</b>	Listen carefully	have these words constantly in your mind*	Give lodgement to these words

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Luke 11:2, 4	253	<b>Our, which art in heaven, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth, but deliver us from evil</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Luke 17:36	68, 77, 154-5	<b>Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Luke 18:12	225, 238	<b>possess</b>	get	get#	acquire
Luke 18:30	135	<b>time, world</b>	age, age	time, world#	period of time, system of things
Luke 20:35	135	<b>world</b>	age	world#	system of things
Luke 23:17	155	<b>(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Luke 24:36	45, 195	<b>Jesus</b>	Jesus	he#	he
John 1:18	107, 197- 200, 209, 258	<b>the only begotten Son</b>	God the only (Son)	the only Son#	the only begotten god
John 1:28	68	<b>Bethabara</b>	Bethany	Bethany*. DR, JR Bethania	Bethany
John 3:13	211, 260	<b>which is in heaven</b>	OMIT	who is in heaven#	OMIT
John 3:36	22, 132-3	<b>believeth not</b>	rejects	refuses to believe#	disobeys



Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
John 5:4	156	<b>For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had</b>	OMIT	for at intervals the angel of the Lord came down into the pool, and the water was disturbed, and the first person to enter the water after the disturbance was cured of any ailment he suffered from*	OMIT
John 6:47	22, 170-2, 262	<b>on me</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
John 7:8	173	<b>yet</b>	yet	OMIT*	yet
John 7:53-8:11	150, 262	<b>And every man...go, and sin no more</b>	NIV inserts 'The earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have John 7:53-8:11'	The JB inserts 'The oldest MSS do not include it or place it elsewhere'#	The NWT inserts the passage in smaller type
John 9:35	210-11, 263	<b>Son of God</b>	Son of Man	Son of Man#	Son of Man
John 14:14	202-3, 263	<b>ask anything</b>	ask me anything	ask for anything, DR, JR ask me anything	ask anything
Acts 2:47	133	<b>such as should be saved</b>	were being saved	destined to be saved#	those being saved
Acts 4:25	174	<b>by the mouth of</b>	by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of	through the Holy Spirit and speaking through*	through holy spirit said by the mouth of

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Acts 5:30	81, 225, 238	<b>ye slew and hanged</b>	you had killed by hanging	had him executed by hanging*	you slew, hanging him
Acts 8:37	67	<b>And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Acts 9:5a	67	<b>And the Lord said</b>	he replied	the voice answered*	He said
Acts 9:5b	67	<b>it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Acts 9:6	67	<b>And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Acts 9:7	229	<b>hearing a voice</b>	heard the sound	heard the voice#	hearing, indeed , the sound
Acts 11:23	131	<b>cleave unto</b>	remain true	remain faithful#	continue in
Acts 12:4	233	<b>Easter</b>	Passover	Passover*	passover
Acts 15:11	46, 195	<b>Lord Jesus Christ</b>	Lord Jesus	Lord Jesus#	Lord Jesus
Acts 16:7	175, 213	<b>the Spirit</b>	the Spirit of Jesus	the Spirit of Jesus*	the spirit of Jesus
Acts 16:31	46, 195	<b>Lord Jesus Christ</b>	Lord Jesus	Lord Jesus*	Lord Jesus

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Acts 17:29	204	<b>Godhead</b>	divine being	the deity, DR, JR the divinity	Divine Being
Acts 19:2	230, 240	<b>since, Ghost</b>	when, Spirit	when#, Spirit#	when, spirit
Acts 19:4	45, 195	<b>Christ Jesus</b>	Jesus	Jesus*	Jesus
Acts 19:10	45, 195	<b>Lord Jesus</b>	Lord	Lord*	Lord
Acts 19:20	67	<b>word of God</b>	word of the Lord	word of the Lord#	word of Jehovah
Acts 20:28	129	<b>to feed</b>	Be shepherds	to feed, DR, JR to rule	to shepherd
Acts 22:9a	229	<b>and were afraid</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Acts 22:9b	229	<b>heard not the voice</b>	did not understand the voice	did not hear his voice#	did not hear the voice
Acts 22:16	175	<b>the name of the Lord</b>	his name	his name*	his name
Acts 25:6	77	<b>more than ten days</b>	eight or ten days	eight or ten days at the most, DR, JR no more than eight or ten days	not more than eight or ten days
Acts 28:13	235	<b>fetch a compass</b>	set sail	followed the coast, DR, JR compassing by the shore	went around
Rom. 1:16	172, 176	<b>of Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Rom. 1:18	115	<b>hold the truth</b>	suppress the truth	keep truth imprisoned*, DR, JR detain the truth	suppressing the truth
Rom. 1:20	204, 220	<b>Godhead</b>	divine nature	deity, DR, JR divinity	Godship
Rom. 1:25	116, 126	<b>changed the truth</b>	exchanged the truth	given up divine truth#	exchanged the truth
Rom. 5:4	131	<b>patience</b>	perseverance	patience#	endurance

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Rom. 8:11	68	<b>by his Spirit</b>	through his Spirit	through his Spirit*. DR, JR because of his Spirit	through his spirit
Rom. 8:28	264	<b>all things work together for good</b>	in all things God works for the good	by turning everything to their good God cooperates#	God makes all his works cooperate together for the good
Rom. 8:34	176-7	<b>Christ</b>	Christ Jesus	Christ Jesus*	Christ Jesus
Rom. 9:5	196-7, 216	<b>Christ came, who is over-all, God blessed</b>	Christ, who is God over all	Christ who is above all, God forever blessed#	Christ [sprang]...: God, who is over all, [be] blessed
Rom. 10:17	58	<b>word of God</b>	word of Christ	word of Christ*	word about Christ
Rom. 11:6	177	<b>But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Rom. 11:32	132	<b>unbelief</b>	disobedience	disobedience#	disobedience
Rom. 12:8	145-6	<b>with simplicity</b>	generously	freely#	with liberality
Rom. 13:9a	229	<b>Thou shalt not kill</b>	Do not murder	You shall not kill#	You must not murder
Rom. 13:9b	229	<b>Thou shalt not bear false witness</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Rom. 14:6	177	<b>and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Rom. 14:10	175, 212-13	<b>judgment seat of Christ</b>	God's judgment seat	judgment seat of God#	judgment seat of God

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Rom. 15:16	144	<b>ministering the gospel</b>	priestly duty of proclaiming the gospel	priestly duty by bringing the Good News, DR, JR sanctifying the gospel	engaging in the holy work of the good news
Rom. 15:29	178	<b>the gospel of</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Rom. 15:31	132	<b>do not believe</b>	unbelievers	unbelievers*	unbelievers
1 Cor. 1:18	133-4	<b>are saved</b>	are being saved	are...on the way to salvation#	are being saved
1 Cor. 4:4	226	<b>I know nothing by myself</b>	My conscience is clear	my conscience does not reproach me, DR, JR not conscious to myself of anything	I am not conscious of anything against myself
1 Cor. 5:4a	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#'	OMIT
1 Cor. 5:4b	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
1 Cor. 9:1	45, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
1 Cor. 10:24	236	<b>another's wealth</b>	the good of others	everybody for the other man, DR, JR that which is another's	but that of the other person
1 Cor. 10:28a	178	<b>unto idols</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
1 Cor. 10:28b	178	<b>for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
1 Cor. 11:24	264	<b>Take, eat, broken</b>	OMIT	OMIT#, DR, JR shall be delivered	OMIT

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
1 Cor. 16:13	237	<b>quit you like men</b>	be men of courage	Be brave#, DR, JR do manfully	carry on as men
1 Cor. 16:22	45, 195	<b>Jesus Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
2 Cor. 2:15	134	<b>are saved</b>	are being saved	are being saved#	are being saved
2 Cor. 2:17	113-14	<b>corrupt the word of God</b>	peddle the word of God	offering the word of God for sale#, DR, JR adulterating the word of God	peddlers of the word of God
2 Cor. 4:3	134	<b>are lost</b>	are perishing	are not on the way to salvation#	are perishing
2 Cor. 4:10	45, 195	<b>the Lord</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
2 Cor. 5:18	46, 195	<b>Jesus</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
2 Cor. 6:4	131	<b>patience</b>	endurance	fortitude#	endurance
2 Cor. 8:21	142	<b>Providing for honest things</b>	taking pains to do what is right	trying to do right, DR, JR forecast what may be good	make honest provision
2 Cor. 11:31	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
2 Cor. 12:12	131	<b>patience</b>	perseverance	unfailingly produced#	endurance
Gal. 1:4	135-6	<b>world</b>	age	world#	system of things
Gal. 5:21	265	<b>murders</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Eph. 1:18	67	<b>understanding</b>	heart	mind, DR, JR heart	heart
Eph. 1:21	135	<b>world</b>	age	age#	system of things
Eph. 2:1	135	<b>hath he quickened</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	God made alive
Eph. 2:5	134	<b>ye are saved</b>	you have been saved	you have been saved#	you have been saved

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Eph. 3:9a	67, 179	<b>fellowship</b>	administration	to be dis- pensed*	administered
Eph. 3:9b	67, 179	<b>by Jesus Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Eph. 3:14	265	<b>of our Lord Jesus Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Eph. 4:12	145	<b>perfecting</b>	prepare	make a unity#	view to the readjustment
Eph. 4:22	134	<b>corrupt</b>	being cor- rupted	gets cor- rupted#	being cor- rupted
Eph. 4:24	130	<b>new man, is created</b>	new self, cre- ated to be	new self, has been created#	new personal- ity, was cre- ated
Phil. 1:14	153, 180	<b>the word</b>	the word of God	announcing the message, DR, JR the word of God	the word of God
Phil. 2:6	211- 12	<b>thought it not robbery to be equal with God</b>	did not con- sider equality with God something to be grasped	did not cling to his equality with God#	gave no con- sideration to a seizure, namely, that he should be equal with God
Phil. 4:8	142	<b>honest</b>	noble	noble, DR, JR modest	serious con- cern
Phil. 4:13	266	<b>Christ</b>	him	the One, DR, JR him	him
Col. 1:2	37-8, 156, 163	<b>and the Lord Jesus Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT# DR, JR verse 3, add 'Jesus,' verse 2	OMIT
Col. 1:14	158, 162-3, 266	<b>through his blood</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Col. 1:23	131	<b>grounded and settled</b>	established and firm	persevere and stand firm#	established and steadfast
Col. 2:9	197, 203-4	<b>Godhead</b>	Deity	divinity#	the divine quality

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Col. 2:11	181	<b>the body of the sins of the flesh</b>	the sinful nature	your body of flesh*	the body of the flesh
Col. 2:14	143	<b>his cross</b>	the cross	the cross*	the torture stake
Col. 2:18	181-2, 267	<b>he hath not seen</b>	he has seen	some vision they have had#	he has seen
1 Thess. 3:11	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	Christ#	OMIT
1 Thess. 5:14	236	<b>febleminded</b>	timid	apprehensive#	depressed souls
1 Thess. 5:22	115	<b>appearance of evil</b>	kind of evil	form of evil#	form of wickedness
2 Thess. 1:8	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
2 Thess. 1:12	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
2 Thess. 2:7	237	<b>letteth</b>	holds it back	holding it back, DR, JR holdeth	acting as a restraint
1 Tim. 1:17	182	<b>the only wise God</b>	the only God	the...only God*	the only God
1 Tim. 3:16	59, 197, 207-9	<b>God was manifest in the flesh</b>	He appeared in a body	He was made visible in the flesh, DR, JR which was manifested	He was made manifest in flesh
1 Tim. 6:5	117	<b>gain is godliness</b>	godliness is a means to financial gain	religion is a way of making a profit#	godly devotion is a means of gain
1 Tim. 6:10	113, 139-40	<b>the root of all evil</b>	a root of all kinds of evil	the root of all evils*	a root of all sorts of injurious things
2 Tim. 2:12	131-2	<b>suffer</b>	endure	hold firm#	enduring
2 Tim. 2:15a	140	<b>Study to shew</b>	Do your best to present	Do all you can to present#	Do your utmost to present



Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
2 Tim. 2:15b	140	<b>rightly dividing the word of truth</b>	correctly handles the word of truth	has kept a straight course with the message of the truth, DR, JR rightly handling	handling the word of truth aright
2 Tim. 2:19	67	<b>Christ</b>	the Lord	the Lord*	Jehovah
2 Tim. 3:3	145-6	<b>despisers of those that are good</b>	not lovers of the good	enemies of everything that is good, DR, JR without kindness	without love of goodness
2 Tim. 3:12	145	<b>will live godly</b>	wants to live a godly life	tries to live in devotion#	desiring to live with godly devotion
2 Tim. 3:17	145	<b>perfect</b>	thoroughly equipped	fully equipped#	fully competent
Titus 1:8	145-6	<b>lover of good men</b>	loves what is good	friend of all that is good, DR, JR gentle	lover of goodness
Titus 2:12	135	<b>world</b>	age	world#	system of things
Titus 2:13	81, 196-7, 201-2, 267-70	<b>the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ</b>	our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ	our great God and saviour Christ Jesus#	the great God and of the Savior of us, Christ Jesus
Heb. 3:1	45, 195, 270	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Heb. 3:18	132	<b>believed not</b>	disobeyed	disobedient, DR, JR incredulous	acted disobediently
Heb. 4:6	132	<b>unbelief</b>	disobedience	disobedience#	disobedience
Heb. 4:11	132	<b>unbelief</b>	disobedience	disobedience#	disobedience
Heb. 4:12a	141	<b>quick</b>	living	something alive, DR, JR living	alive

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Heb. 4:12b	141	<b>and powerful</b>	and active	and active, DR, JR and effectual	and exerts power
Heb. 9:7	226-7	<b>errors</b>	sins...commit ted in igno- rance	faults, DR, JR ignorance	sins of igno- rance
Heb. 10:23	131-2, 226	<b>profession of our faith</b>	hope we pro- fess	hope we pro- fess, DR, JR confession of our hope	public declara- tion of our hope
Heb. 10:36	131	<b>patience</b>	persevere	endurance#	endurance
Heb. 13:21	145	<b>perfect</b>	everything good	ready to do his will, DR, JR all good- ness	every good thing
James 1:21	237	<b>superfluity of naughtiness</b>	evil that is so prevalent	bad habits that are still left in you, DR, JR abundance of naughtiness	that superflu- ous thing, badness
James 3:2	226	<b>in many things we of- fend all</b>	all stumble in many ways	everyone of us does some- thing wrong, over and over again, DR, JR in many things we all offend	all stumble many times
James 5:16	182-3	<b>faults</b>	sins	sins*	sins
1 Pet. 1:5	131	<b>are kept</b>	are shielded	will guard, DR, JR are kept by faith	are being safeguarded
1 Pet. 2:2	183-4	<b>grow thereby</b>	grow up in your salvation	grow up to salvation, DR, JR grow unto salvation	grow to salva- tion
1 Pet. 2:9	144	<b>a peculiar people</b>	a people be- longing to God	a people set apart, DR, JR a purchased people	a people for special pos- session
1 Pet. 2:12	142	<b>honest</b>	good	honourably, DR, JR good	fine

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
1 Pet. 3:14-15	204-5	<b>Lord God</b>	Christ as Lord	the Lord Christ*	the Christ as Lord
2 Pet. 1:1	196-7, 201-2, 267-70	<b>God and our Saviour Jesus Christ</b>	our God and Saviour Jesus Christ	our God and Saviour Jesus Christ*	our God and the Saviour Jesus Christ
1 John 1:7	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
1 John 4:3	184-5	<b>Christ is come in the flesh</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
1 John 5:7	60-2, 86, 150, 255	<b>in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
1 John 5:8	60-2, 86, 150, 255	<b>And there are three that bear witness in earth</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
2 John 3	46, 195	<b>the Lord</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Jude 1a	271	<b>sanctified</b>	loved	dear to, DR, JR beloved	loved
Jude 1b	271	<b>preserved in Jesus Christ</b>	kept by Jesus Christ	kept safe for Jesus Christ#	preserved for Jesus Christ
Jude 4	206	<b>the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ</b>	Jesus Christ our only Sovereign and Lord	our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ, DR, JR the only sovereign Ruler, and our Lord Jesus Christ	our only Owner and Lord, Jesus Christ
Rev. 1:6	65	<b>kings</b>	a kingdom	A line of kings, DR, JR a kingdom	a kingdom

Verse	Page	AV1611	NIV	JB	NWT
Rev. 1:8a	65	<b>Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending</b>	the Alpha and the Omega	the Alpha and the Omega#	the Alpha and the Omega
Rev. 1:8b	65	<b>the Lord</b>	the Lord God	the Lord God*	Jehovah God
Rev. 1:9a	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Rev. 1:9b	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Rev. 1:11a	183	<b>I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Rev. 1:11b	183	<b>which are in Asia</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Rev. 5:14	66	<b>four and twenty, him that liveth for ever and ever</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Rev. 12:17	46, 195	<b>Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Rev. 14:1	65-6, 108	<b>his Father's name</b>	his name and his Father's name	his name and his Father's name*	his name and the name of his Father
Rev. 15:3	66	<b>thou King of saints</b>	King of the ages	King of nations, DR, JR King of ages	King of eternity
Rev. 16:5	65	<b>and shalt be</b>	the Holy One	the Just One, DR, JR the Holy One	the loyal One
Rev. 17:8	65	<b>yet is</b>	yet will come	still to come, DR, JR OMIT	yet will be present
Rev. 19:1	186	<b>the Lord</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Rev. 20:13	137	<b>hell</b>	Hades	Hades#	Hades
Rev. 20:14	137	<b>hell</b>	Hades	Hades#	Hades
Rev. 22:19	66	<b>book of life</b>	tree of life	tree of life#	trees of life

\* JB reads with DR, the Douay-Rheims Challoner Revision, 1749-1752 and Jesuit Rheims 1582 NT, JR

# DR, JR reads with AV1611

Otherwise, DR, JR readings differ from both AV1611 and JB

Page numbers for chapters in James White's book are as follows, in **bold**:

*Introduction* **iii**,

*Chapter 1* **1**, *Chapter 2* **9**, *Chapter 3* **19**, *Chapter 4* **53**, *Chapter 5* **91**, *Chapter 6* **127**,  
*Chapter 7* **149**, *Chapter 8* **193**, *Chapter 9* **223**, *Chapter 10* **243**,

*Part Two* **251**.

**Results of Verse Comparison, Table A1**

**241 Passages of Scripture, 252 Verses in Total**

**Table A2**

**Other Versions in Agreement with Each Other, with AV1611, Table A1**

NIV, JB, DR, JR, NWT		
NIV, JB, DR, JR	Mark 1:1, Rom. 9:5	2
NIV, JB, NWT		
NIV, JB		
NIV, NWT		
NIV	Amos 4:4, Matt. 4:18, 12:25, 19:18, Mark 10:52, Luke 24:36, John 7:8	7
DR, JR, JB, NWT	Acts 22:9b, Rom. 5:4	2
DR, JR, JB	1 Chron. 5:26, Matt. 12:32, Mark 7:16, 10:30, John 3:13, Acts 2:47, 9:7, 13:9a, Gal. 1:4, 1 Thess. 3:11, 1 Tim. 6:10, Titus 2:12	12
DR, JR, NWT	Gen. 50:20, Matt. 19:18, Acts 19:20, 1 Cor. 16:13	4
DR, JR	1 Sam. 10:24, 17:6, 2 Sam. 14:20, 2 Ki. 3:9, Ps. 8:5, Song 2:12, Isa. 7:14, 14:12, 19:10, Hos. 13:9, Mic. 5:2, Mal. 2:12, Matt. 1:25, 4:18, 8:29, 12:25, 16:2, 17:20, 21, 18:11, 19:17b, 20:16, 21:12, 27:35, 28:20, Mark 1:3, 9:18, 29, 44, 46, 10:24, 11:26, 15:28, 16:9-20, Luke 2:22, 3:14, 4:34, 9:35, 17:36, 18:12, 23:17, 24:36, John 1:18, 6:47, 7:53-8:11, 9:35, Acts 8:37, 9:5b, 6, 11:23, 15:11, 19:2, Rom. 1:25, 8:28, 11:32, 12:8, 13:9b, 14:10, 15:29, 1 Cor. 1:18, 5:4a, 9:1, 10:28a, 11:24, 22, 2 Cor. 2:15, 17, 4:3, 6:4, 11:31, 12:12, 5:21, Eph. 1:21, 2:5, 3:14, 4:12, 22, 24, Phil. 2:6, Col. 1:2, 14, 23, 2:9, 18, 1 Thess. 5:14, 22, 2 Thess. 1:8, 12, 1 Tim. 6:5, 2 Tim. 2:12, 15a, 3:12, 17, Titus 2:13, Heb. 3:18, 4:6, 11, 10:36, 1 John 1:7, 5:7, 8, Jude 1b, Rev. 1:8a, 1:9a, 11b, 5:14, 12:17, 20:13, 14, 22:19	109
JB, NWT	John 14:14	1
JB	Mark 2:15, Acts 20:28, Rev. 1:6	3
NWT	Ps. 12:6-7, John 7:8, Acts 5:30, 2 Cor. 8:21, Eph. 2:1, Heb. 4:12b, 2 Pet. 1:1	7

Table A3

## Other Versions in Agreement with Each Other, against AV1611, Table A1

NIV, JB, DR, JR, NWT	Gen. 36:24, 1 Sam. 2:25, Matt. 6:13, 15:8, 19:17a, 20:22, 25:13, Mark 1:2, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 10:21, Luke 2:14, 22, 33, 11:2, 4, John 1:28, Acts 4:25, 9:5a, 12:4, 16:7, 31, 17:29, 19:4, 10, 22:9a, 16, 25:6, Rom. 1:16, 18, 8:11, 34, 10:17, 11:6, 14:6, 15:31, 1 Cor. 4:4, 5:4b, 10:24, 28b, 2 Cor. 4:10, 5:18, Eph. 1:18, 3:9b, Phil. 4:13, Col. 2:14, 2 Thess. 2:7, 1 Tim. 1:17, 3:16, 2 Tim. 2:15b, 2:19, Heb. 3:1, 4:12a, 10:23, James 3:2, 5:16, 1 Pet. 2:2, 9, 12, 3:14-15, Jude 4, Rev. 1:8b, 1:9b, 11a, 14:1, 15:3, 16:5, 19:1	68
NIV, JB, DR, JR	1 Ki. 10:28, Ps. 12:6-7, Mark 1:24, Acts 5:30, Rom. 1:20, 2 Cor. 8:21, Eph. 2:1, 2 Pet. 1:1	8
NIV, DR, JR, NWT	Phil. 1:14, Heb. 9:7, 13:21, Jude 1a, Rev. 1:6	5
NIV, JB, NWT	1 Sam. 10:24, 17:6, 27:10, 2 Sam. 14:20, 2 Ki. 3:9, Song 2:12, Isa. 7:14, 19:10, 65:11, Mic. 5:2, Matt. 1:25, 8:29, 16:20, 17:20, 21, 18:11, 19:17b, 20:16, 21:12, 23:14, 27:35, Mark 1:3, 9:29, 44, 46, 10:24, 11:26, 15:28, 16:9-20, Luke 2:22, 4:34, 9:35, 17:36, 18:12, 23:17, John 6:47, 7:53-8:11, 9:35, Acts 8:37, 9:5b, 6, 15:11, 19:2, Rom. 1:25, 8:28, 11:32, 12:8, 13:9b, 14:10, 15:29, 1 Cor. 1:18, 5:4a, 9:1, 10:28a, 11:24, 16:22, 2 Cor. 2:15, 17, 4:3, 6:4, 11:31, Gal. 5:21, Eph. 2:5, 3:14, 4:22, 24, Phil. 2:6, Col. 1:2, 14, 2:9, 18, 1 Thess. 5:22, 2 Thess. 1:8, 12, 1 Tim. 6:5, 2 Tim. 2:12, 15a, 3:3, 12, 17, Titus 1:8, 2:13, Heb. 3:18, 4:6, 11, 10:36, 1 John 1:7, 5:7, 8, 4:3, 2 John 3, Rev. 1:8a, 1:9a, 11b, 5:14, 12:17, 17:8, 20:13, 14, 22:19	100
NIV, JB	Gen. 50:20, Isa. 14:12, 26:3, Hos. 13:9, Mal. 2:12, Mark 9:18, Luke 3:14, Acts 19:20, Rom. 15:16, 1 Cor. 16:13, Eph. 1:21, Phil. 4:8, 1 Thess. 5:14, Heb. 4:12b	14
NIV, NWT	Lev. 14:10, Joshua 15:3, 1 Chron. 5:26, Ps. 8:5, Mark 2:15, 7:16, John 3:13, 5:4, Acts 2:47, 9:7, 20:28, 22:9b, Rom. 5:4, 13:9a, 2 Cor. 12:12, Eph. 3:9a, Col. 1:23, 1 Thess. 3:11, 1 Tim. 6:10	19
NIV, DR, JR	John 14:14	1
NIV	Matt. 12:32, 28:20, Mark 10:30, Luke 9:44, 18:30, 20:35, John 1:18, 3:36, Acts 11:23, 28:13, Gal. 1:4, Eph. 4:12, Col. 2:11, Titus 2:12, James 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:5, Jude 1b	17

Table A4

## Overall Comparison of Scripture Passages, Table A1, 241 NIV Passages in Total

Versions	With AV1611	%age	Against AV1611	%age
NIV, JB, DR, JR, NWT	0	0	68	28
NIV, JB, DR, JR	2	1	8	3
NIV, DR, JR, NWT	0	0	5	2
NIV, JB, NWT	0	0	100	41
NIV, DR, JR	0	0	1	<1
NIV, JB	0	0	14	6
NIV, NWT	0	0	19	8
NIV	7	3	17	7
DR, JR, JB, NWT	2	1	0	0
DR, JR, JB	12	5	0	0
DR, JR, NWT	4	2	0	0
DR, JR	109	45	0	0
JB, NWT	1	<1	0	0
JB	3	1	0	0
NWT	7	3	0	0
Total	147	61	232	96

## Notes:

1. %ages do not sum to 100 because the calculation is based on the overall total of 241 passages of scripture.
2. Some approximation occurs via rounding for the individual %ages so that the total %ages are based on the totals in the **With AV1611** and **Against AV1611** columns respectively.
3. Only the NIV passages sum to 241 in Tables A2, A3. Passages have been ignored in the overall comparison where the JR, DR, JB and NWT or combinations of these versions departed from both the AV1611 and the NIV.
4. The NIV agrees with the JR, DR, JB, NWT 28% against the AV1611, in 68 passages, with the JB, NWT 70% against the AV1611, in 168 passages and with the JB or DR, JR or NWT 89% against the AV1611, in 215 passages.
5. The JR, DR agree with the AV1611 in 129 or 54% of the passages but the NIV in only 9 or 4% of the passages..
6. The NIV overall departs from the AV1611 in 232 of the 241 passages, or 96%. Its departures closely match those of Rome and Watchtower – see Point 4 above – but actually exceed those of the JB, NWT, at 221\* and 227\* departures or 92% and 94% respectively. \*Obtained by difference, 241-20, 241-14 respectively.



Table A5

Comparison of the AV1611, 1582 JR, DR, RV, NIV, NRSV From Wilkinson<sup>12</sup>

Verse	AV1611	1582 JR*	RV	NIV	NRSV
Matt. 2:15	<b>have I called my son</b>	have I called my son*	did I call my son	I called my son	I have called my son
Matt. 5:44a	<b>bless them that curse you</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Matt. 5:44b	<b>do good to them that hate you, despitefully use you</b>	do good to them that hate you, calumniate you*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Matt. 6:13	<b>For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Matt. 17:21	<b>Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting</b>	But this kind is not cast out but by prayer and fasting* [verse 20]	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Matt. 18:2-3	<b>Jesus, be converted</b>	Jesus, be converted*	he, turn	He, change	He, change
Matt. 24:3	<b>end of the world</b>	consummation of the world*	end of the world [marg. consummation of the age]	end of the age	end of the age
Mark 7:19	<b>purging all meats</b>	purging all meats*	This he said, making all meats clean	(In saying this, Jesus declared all foods "clean.")	(Thus he declared all foods clean.)

Verse	AV1611	1582 JR*	RV	NIV	NRSV
Mark 9:29	<b>and fasting</b>	and fasting* [verse 28]	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Luke 1:72	<b>mercy promised to</b>	mercy to*	mercy to-wards	mercy to	mercy promised to
Luke 2:33	<b>Joseph</b>	His father*	His father	The child's father	The child's father
Luke 4:8	<b>Get thee behind me, Satan</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Luke 9:54	<b>even as Elias did</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Luke 9:55-56	<b>and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them</b>	saying: You know not of what spirit you are, The Son of man came not to destroy souls, but to save*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Luke 11:2, 4	<b>Our, which art in heaven, as in heaven, so in earth, but deliver us from evil</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
John 2:11	<b>beginning of miracles</b>	beginning of miracles*	beginning of his signs	first of his miraculous signs	first of his signs

Verse	AV1611	1582 JR*	RV	NIV	NRSV
John 5:39	<b>Search the scriptures</b>	Search the scriptures*	Ye search the scriptures	You diligently study the Scriptures	You search the scriptures
Acts 8:37	<b>And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God</b>	And Philip said: If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answering, said: I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Acts 13:42	<b>The Jews, the Gentiles</b>	they, they*	they, they	Paul and Barnabus, the people	Paul and Barnabus, the people
Acts 15:23	<b>apostles and elders and brethren</b>	apostles and ancients, brethren*	apostles and the elder brethren	apostles and elders, your brothers	brothers, both the apostles and the elders
Acts 16:7	<b>the Spirit</b>	the Spirit of Jesus*	the Spirit of Jesus	the Spirit of Jesus	the Spirit of Jesus
Acts 24:15	<b>of the dead</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Rom. 5:1	<b>we have peace</b>	let us have peace*	let us have peace	we have peace [f.n. let us]	we have peace [f.n. let us]
1 Cor. 5:7	<b>for us</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
1 Cor. 7:5	<b>fasting and</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
1 Cor. 11:24	<b>Take, eat: is broken for you</b>	Take ye, and eat: shall be delivered for you*	OMIT, is for you	OMIT, is for you	OMIT, that is for you

Verse	AV1611	1582 JR*	RV	NIV	NRSV
1 Cor. 11:29	<b>unworthily</b>	unworthily*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
1 Cor. 15:4	<b>he rose again</b>	he rose again*	he hath been raised	he was raised	he was raised
1 Cor. 15:47	<b>the Lord</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Eph. 3:9b	<b>by Jesus Christ</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Eph. 5:30	<b>of his flesh and of his bones</b>	of his flesh, and of his bones*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Phil. 3:21	<b>vile body</b>	body of our lowness*	body of our humiliation	lowly bodies	body of our humiliation
Col. 1:14	<b>through his blood</b>	through his blood*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
1 Tim. 3:16	<b>God was manifest</b>	which was manifested*	He who was manifested	He appeared	He was revealed
2 Tim. 3:16	<b>All scripture is given by inspiration of God</b>	All scripture, inspired of God*	Every scripture inspired of God	All scripture is God-breathed	All scripture is inspired by God [f.n. RV reading]
2 Tim. 4:1	<b>the Lord, at his appearing</b>	OMIT*, and by His advent, DR by his coming	OMIT, and by His advent	OMIT, and in view of his appearing	OMIT, and in view of his appearing
Titus 2:13	<b>glorious appearing</b>	coming of the glory*	appearing of the glory	glorious appearing	manifestation of the glory
Heb. 7:21	<b>after the order of Melchisedec</b>	OMIT*	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Heb. 9:27	<b>the judgment</b>	the judgment*	judgement	judgment	the judgment
Heb. 10:21	<b>high priest</b>	high priest*	great priest	great priest	great priest

Verse	AV1611	1582 JR*	RV	NIV	NRSV
James 5:16	<b>faults</b>	sins*	sins	sins	sins
2 Peter 2:9	<b>reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished</b>	reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be tormented*	keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgement	hold the unrighteous for the day of judgment, while continuing their punishment	keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment
Rev. 13:10	<b>He that leadeth into captivity</b>	He that shall lead into captivity*	If any man is for captivity	If anyone is to go into captivity	If you are to be taken captive
Rev. 22:14	<b>do his commandments</b>	wash their stoles, DR wash their robes in the blood of the lamb	wash their robes	wash their robes	wash their robes

\*Reads with DR, the Douay-Rheims Challoner Revision, 1749-1752

## 45 Passages of Scripture, 46 Verses in Total, Table A5

Table A6

## Other Versions in Agreement with Each Other, with AV1611, Table A5

NIV, JR, DR	John 2:11	1
NIV, NRSV	Rom. 5:1, 2 Tim. 3:16	2
NIV	Titus 2:13	1
JR, DR, RV	Matt. 24:3	1
JR, DR, NRSV	Heb. 9:27	1
JR, DR	Matt. 2:15, 5:44b, 17:21, 18:2-3, Mark 7:19, 9:29, Luke 9:55-56, John 5:39, Acts 8:37, 1 Cor. 11:24, 29, 15:4, Eph. 5:30, Col. 1:14, Heb. 10:21, 2 Peter 2:9, Rev. 13:10	17
NRSV	Luke 1:72	1

Table A7

## Other Versions in Agreement with Each Other, against AV1611, Table A5

NIV, JR, DR, RV, NRSV	Matt. 6:13, Luke 2:33, 4:8, 9:54, 11:2, 4, Acts 13:42, 15:23, 16:7, 24:15, 1 Cor. 5:7, 7:5, 15:47, Eph. 3:9b, Phil. 3:21, 1 Tim. 3:16, 2 Tim. 4:1, James 5:16, Rev. 22:14	19
NIV, JR, DR, RV	Luke 1:72	1
NIV, RV, NRSV	Matt. 2:15, 5:44a, 5:44b, 17:21, 18:2-3, Mark 7:19, 9:29, Luke 9:54, 55-56, John 5:39, Acts 8:37, 1 Cor. 11:24, 29, 15:4, Eph. 5:30, Col. 1:14, Heb. 10:21, 2 Peter 2:9, Rev. 13:10	19
NIV, RV	Heb. 9:27	1
NIV, NRSV	Matt. 24:3	1
JR, DR, RV, NRSV	Titus 2:13	1
JR, DR, RV	Rom. 5:1, 2 Tim. 3:16	2
RV, NRSV	John 2:11	1

**Table A8**  
**Overall Comparison of Scripture Passages, Table A5**

<b>Versions</b>	<b>With AV1611</b>	<b>%age</b>	<b>Against AV1611</b>	<b>%age</b>
NIV, JR, DR, RV, NRSV	0	0	19	42
NIV, JR, DR, RV	0	0	1	2
NIV, JR, DR	1	2	0	0
NIV, RV, NRSV	0	0	19	42
NIV, RV	0	0	1	2
NIV, NRSV	2	4	1	2
NIV	1	2	0	0
JR, DR, RV, NRSV	0	0	1	2
JR, DR, RV	1	2	2	4
JR, DR, NRSV	1	2	0	0
JR, DR	17	38	0	0
RV, NRSV	0	0	1	2
NRSV	1	2	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes:

1. %age **With AV1611** does not sum to 100 because calculation is based on total of 45 passages of scripture.
2. Some approximation occurs via rounding for the individual %ages so that the total %ages are based on the totals in the **With AV1611** and **Against AV1611** columns respectively.
3. The NIV, NRSV agree with the JR, DR, RV 42% against the AV1611 and with the RV 84% against the AV1611.
4. The RV departs from the AV1611 in 44 of the 45 passages, or 98%. The NIV departs in 41, or 91% and with the RV against the AV1611 in 40 passages, or 89%.
5. Tables A5-A8 therefore show that the NIV is essentially a Westcott and Hort text with respect to these selected passages on important doctrine, including the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. See Table A9 for a more detailed comparison of readings that bear on the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.





Verse	AV1611	JR/DR	RV	NIV	NRSV	JB	NWT
23:42	<b>Jesus, Lord</b>	Jesus: Lord	Jesus	Jesus	Jesus	Jesus	Jesus
John							
1:18	<b>the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father</b>	the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father	the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father	God the One and Only, who is at the Father's side	God the only Son, who is close to the Father's heart	The only Son, who is nearest to the Father's heart	the only-begotten god who is in the bosom with the Father
1:27	<b>pre-ferred before me</b>	preferred before me	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
3:13	<b>which is in heaven</b>	who is in heaven	which is in heaven	OMIT	OMIT	who is in heaven	OMIT
6:69a	<b>that Christ</b>	the Christ (70a)	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
6:69b	<b>the Son of the living God</b>	the Son of God (70b)	the Holy One of God	the Holy One of God	the Holy One of God	the Holy One of God	the Holy One of God
9:35	<b>Son of God</b>	Son of God	Son of God	Son of Man	Son of Man	Son of Man	Son of man
Acts							
3:13	<b>his Son Jesus</b>	his Son Jesus	his Ser- vant Je- sus	his ser- vant Je- sus	his ser- vant Je- sus	his Ser- vant Je- sus	his Ser- vant, Je- sus
3:26	<b>his Son Jesus</b>	his Son	his Ser- vant	his ser- vant	his ser- vant	his Ser- vant	his Ser- vant
4:27	<b>holy child Jesus</b>	holy child Jesus	holy Ser- vant Jesus	holy ser- vant Je- sus	holy ser- vant Je- sus	holy ser- vant Je- sus	holy ser- vant Je- sus

Verse	AV1611	JR/DR	RV	NIV	NRSV	JB	NWT
4:30	<b>holy child Jesus</b>	holy Son Jesus	holy Servant Jesus	holy servant Jesus	holy servant Jesus	holy servant Jesus	holy servant Jesus
Rom. 14:10	<b>judgement seat of Christ</b>	judgement seat of Christ	judgement seat of God	God's judgement seat	judgement seat of God	judgement seat of God	judgement seat of God
1 Cor. 15:47	<b>the Lord</b>	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Eph. 3:9	<b>by Jesus Christ</b>	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT
Phil. 2:6	<b>thought it not robbery to be equal with God</b>	thought it not robbery to be equal with God	counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God	did not consider equality with God something to be grasped	did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited	did not cling to his equality with God	gave no consideration to a seizure, namely, that he should be equal with God
Col. 2:9	<b>God-head</b>	Godhead	Godhead	Deity	deity	divinity	divine quality
1 Tim.							
3:16	<b>God was manifest in the flesh</b>	which was manifested	He who was manifested	He appeared in a body	He was revealed in flesh	He was made visible in the flesh	He was made manifest in flesh

Verse	AV1611	JR/DR	RV	NIV	NRSV	JB	NWT
6: 15	<b>Which in his times he shall shew who is the blessed and only Potentate</b>	Which in his times he shall shew who is the Blessed and only Mighty	Which in its own times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only potentate	which God will bring about in his own time God, the blessed and only Ruler	which he will bring about at the right time he who is the blessed and only Sovereign	Who at the due times will be revealed by God, the blessed and only ruler of all,	This manifestation the happy and only Potentate will show in its own appointed times, he the King
Tit. 2:13	<b>the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ</b>	the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ	our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ	our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ	our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ	our great God and Saviour Christ Jesus	the great God and of the Savior of us, Christ Jesus

Verse	AV1611	JR/DR	RV	NIV	NRSV	JB	NWT
Heb.							
1:3	<b>Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person</b>	Who being the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance	Who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance	The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being	He is the reflection of God's glory and the exact imprint of God's very being	He is the radiant light of God's glory and the perfect copy of his nature	He is the reflection of his glory and the exact representation of his very being
1:8	<b>Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever</b>	Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever	Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever	Your throne, O God, will last for ever and ever	Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever	your throne shall last for ever and ever	God is your throne forever and ever
2 Pe. 1:1	<b>God and our Saviour Jesus Christ</b>	our God and Saviour Jesus Christ	our God and Saviour Jesus Christ	our God and Saviour Jesus Christ	our God and Saviour Jesus Christ	our God and Saviour Jesus Christ	our God and the Savior Jesus Christ
1 John							
3:16	<b>Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us</b>	In this we have known the charity of God, because he hath laid down his life for us	Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us	This is how we know what love is: Jesus Christ laid down his life for us	We know love by this, that he laid down his life for us	This has taught us love – that he gave up his life for us	By this we have come to know love, because that one surrendered his soul for us

Verse	AV1611	JR/DR	RV	NIV	NRSV	JB	NWT
4:3	<b>every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh</b>	every spirit that dissolveth Jesus	every spirit which confesseth not Jesus	every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus	every spirit that does not confess Jesus	any spirit which will not say this of Jesus	every inspired expression that does not confess Jesus
5:7	<b>For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one</b>	And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. And these three are one	OMIT, verse 6 is split to give And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth	For there are three that testify	There are three that testify	so that there are three witnesses	For there are three witness bearers
5:8a	<b>And there are three that bear witness in earth</b>	And there are three that give testimony on earth	For there are three who bear witness	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT

Verse	AV1611	JR/DR	RV	NIV	NRSV	JB	NWT
Rev. 1:11	<b>I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last</b>	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT	OMIT

**Table A9 has 37 Passages of Scripture, 36 Verses in Total**

**Table A10**

**Other Versions in Agreement with Each Other, with AV1611, Table A9**

JR/DR, RV, NRSV, NWT	1 Tim. 6:15	1
JR/DR, RV, JB	John 1:18, (JB omits <b>“begotten”</b> ), 3:13	2
JR/DR, RV, NRSV	Heb. 1:8	1
JR/DR, RV	Mic. 5:2, John, 9:35, Col. 2:9, Heb. 1:3, 1 John 5:8a (RV omits <b>“on earth”</b> )	5
JR/DR, NWT	Tit. 2:13	1
JR/DR	Matt. 19:16, (has <b>“master,”</b> not <b>“Master”</b> ), Luke 23:42, John 1:27, 6:69a, 6:69b (omits <b>“living”</b> ), Acts 3:13, 26 (omits <b>“Jesus”</b> ), 4:27, 30, Romans 14:10, Phil. 2:6, Tit. 2:13, 1 John 3:16	13
RV	Matt. 8:2, 9:18, 15:25, 20:20, Mark 5:6	5

**Table A11****Other Versions in Agreement with Each Other, against AV1611, Table A9**

JR/DR, RV, NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	Matt. 19:17, Luke 2:33, 43, 1 Cor. 15:47, Eph. 3:9, 1 Tim. 3:16, 2 Pet. 1:1, 1 John 4:3, Rev. 1:11	9
JR/DR, NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	Matt. 8:2, 9:18, 15:25, 20:20, Mark 5:6	5
RV, NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	Matt. 19:16, Luke 23:42, John 1:27, 6:69a, 6:69b, Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30, Romans 14:10, Phil 2:6, 1 John 3:16, 1 John 5:7	13
RV, NIV, NRSV, JB	Tit. 2:13	1
NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	Mic. 5:2, John 9:35, Col. 2:9, Heb. 1:3, 1 John 5:8a	5
NIV, NRSV, NWT	John 1:18, 3:13	2
NIV, JB, NWT	Heb. 1:8	1
NIV, JB	1 Tim. 6:15	1

**Table A12**  
**Overall Comparison of Scripture Passages, Table A9**

<b>Versions</b>	<b>With AV1611</b>	<b>%age</b>	<b>Against AV1611</b>	<b>%age</b>
JR/DR, RV, NRSV, NWT	1	3	0	0
JR/DR, RV, JB	2	5	0	0
JR/DR, RV, NRSV	1	3	0	0
JR/DR, RV	5	14	0	0
JR/DR, NWT	1	3	0	0
JR/DR	13	35	0	0
RV	5	14	0	0
JR/DR, RV, NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	0	0	9	24
JR/DR, NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	0	0	5	14
RV, NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	0	0	13	35
RV, NIV, NRSV, JB	0	0	1	3
NIV, NRSV, JB, NWT	0	0	5	14
NIV, NRSV, NWT	0	0	2	5
NIV, JB, NWT	0	0	1	3
NIV, JB	0	0	1	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes:

1. The basic comparison is the AV1611 versus the NIV, according to Cloud's approach. Therefore, the NIV does not feature with the versions that agree with the AV1611.
2. %age **With AV1611** does not sum to 100 because calculation is based on total of 37 passages of scripture.
3. Some approximation occurs via rounding for the individual %ages so that the total %ages are based on the totals in the **With AV1611** and **Against AV1611** columns respectively.
4. The NIV, NRSV agree with the JR/DR, JB, NWT 24% against the AV1611, with the RV, JB, NWT 59% against the AV1611 and with the JB, NWT 86% against the AV1611. The %ages are based on the passage totals, not the sum of individual %ages.
5. The popular modern versions such as the NIV, NRSV are strongly in agreement with Rome and Watchtower *against* the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.



Table A13

AV1611 Readings Versus NIV Footnotes, from Salliby<sup>71</sup> p 70-4

Individual Words in the AV1611 Readings Disputed by the NIV are Underlined

Verse	AV1611 Reading	NIV Footnote
Matt. 12:47	<i>Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee.</i>	Some manuscripts do not have verse 47.
Matt. 16:2, 3	<i>He answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the sky is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather to day: for the sky is red and lowring. O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?</i>	Some early manuscripts do not have the rest of verse 2 and all of verse 3.
Matt. 16:18	<i>And I say also unto thee, That thou art <u>Peter</u>, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.</i>	<i>Peter</i> means rock.
Matt. 21:44	<i>And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.</i>	Some manuscripts do not have verse 44.
Matt. 27:54	<i>Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was <u>the Son</u> of God.</i>	Or a son
Mark 1:1	<i>The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, <u>the Son of God</u>.</i>	Some manuscripts do not have <i>the Son of God</i> .
Mark 15:39	<i>And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he <u>so cried out, and gave up the ghost</u>, he said, Truly this man was <u>the Son</u> of God.</i>	Some manuscripts do not have <i>heard his cry and</i> *. *NIV reads <i>the centurion, who stood there in front of Jesus, <u>heard his cry and saw how he died</u></i> Or a son

Verse	AV1611 Reading	NIV Footnote
Mark 16:9-20	See Table A1	((The most reliable early manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20.))
Luke 22:43, 44	<i>And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.</i>	Some early manuscripts do not have verses 43 and 44.
Luke 23:34	<i>Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.</i>	Some early manuscripts do not have this sentence.
John 7:8	<i>Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not <u>yet</u> full come.</i>	Some early manuscripts do not have yet.
John 7:53-8:11	See Table A1	<i>((The earliest and most reliable manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11.))</i>
John 10:9	<i>I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be <u>saved</u>, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.</i>	Or <i>kept safe</i>
John 10:29	<i><u>My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.</u></i>	Many early manuscripts <i>What my Father has given me is greater than all</i>
Acts 7:46	<i>Who found favour before God, and desired to find a tabernacle for <u>the God of Jacob</u>.</i>	Some early manuscripts <i>the house of Jacob</i>
Acts 20:28	<i>Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church <u>of God</u>, which he hath purchased with his own blood.</i>	Many manuscripts <i>of the Lord</i>
Rom. 9:5	<i>Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh <u>Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.</u> Amen.</i>	Or <i>Christ, who is over all. God be forever praised! Or Christ. God who is over all be forever praised!</i>

Verse	AV1611 Reading	NIV Footnote
1 Cor. 16:24	<i>My love be with you all in Christ Jesus.</i> <u><i>Amen.</i></u>	Some manuscripts do not have <i>Amen</i> . (Author's note. An earlier NIV omits <i>Amen</i> , without a footnote.)

Table A13 (!) shows that the NIV is clearly a “*Yea, hath God said?*” bible – from the Devil.

Table A14

AV1611 Readings; White<sup>3 p 78ff</sup>, 1611 Edition\*, Cambridge Cameo Edition

\*1<sup>st</sup> Edition Oxford Reprint and 1st Edition Photographic Reproduction of the Original 1611 King James New Testament

Verses Grouped as Cited by White, Source Edition from *Brewer's Dictionary*<sup>98 p 106ff</sup>

Verse	White's Citation	1611 1 <sup>st</sup> Edition	Cambridge Cameo
"printer's errors"			
Genesis 24:61	<i>her camels</i> 1823	<i>her damsels</i>	<i>her damsels</i>
Exodus 20:14	<i>shalt commit</i> King's printer, 1631	<i>shalt not commit</i>	<i>shalt not commit</i>
1 Kings 8:19	<i>lions</i> 1804	<i>loynes</i>	<i>loins</i>
Psalms 119:161	<i>printers</i> 1702	<i>Princes</i>	<i>Princes</i>
Ezekiel 47:10	<i>fishes</i> 1806	<i>fishers</i>	<i>fishers</i>
Matthew 26:36	<i>cometh Judas</i> 1611, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition	<i>cometh Iesus</i>	<i>cometh Jesus</i>
Luke 14:26	<i>his own wife</i> 1810	<i>his owne life</i>	<i>his own life</i>
Luke 20	<i>Vinegar</i> Oxford, 1717	<i>Vineyard</i>	<i>vineyard</i>
Luke 22:34	<i>Philip</i> Oxford, 1792	<i>Peter</i>	<i>Peter</i>
John 5:14	<i>sin on more</i> Ireland, 1716	<i>sinne no more</i>	<i>sin no more</i>
1 Corinthians 6:9	<i>shall inherit</i> Cambridge, 1653	<i>shall not inherite</i>	<i>shall not inherit</i>
Revelation 21:1	<i>more sea</i> 1641	<i>no more sea</i>	<i>no more sea</i>

Verse	White's Citation	1611 1 <sup>st</sup> Edition	Cambridge Cameo
<i>KJV Revisions</i>			
Deuteronomy 26:1	<i>the Lord</i>	<i>the Lord</i>	<i>the Lord thy God</i>
Joshua 13:29	<i>Manasseh</i>	<i>Manasseh</i>	<i>the children of Manasseh</i>
Psalms 69:32	<i>seek good</i>	<i>seeke good</i>	<i>seek God</i>
Jeremiah 49:1	<i>inherit God</i>	<i>inherit God</i>	<i>inherit Gad</i>
Matthew 16:16	<i>Thou art Christ</i>	<i>Thou art Christ</i>	<i>Thou art the Christ</i>
Mark 10:18	<i>no man good,</i>	<i>no man good,</i>	<i>none good</i>
1 Corinthians 4:9	<i>approved unto</i>	<i>approued to</i>	<i>appointed to</i>
1 John 5:12	<i>the Son</i>	<i>the Sonne,</i>	<i>the Son of God</i>
<i>Modern Differences</i>			
Ruth 3:15	<i>he</i> 1611, 1 <sup>st</sup> Edition	<i>he</i>	<i>she</i>
Jeremiah 34:16	<i>he had set</i> (Oxford)	<i>yee had set</i>	<i>ye had set</i>
Matthew 4:2	<i>an hungred</i> <i>an hungered</i> <i>ahungered</i>	<i>an hungred</i>	<i>an hungred</i>

James White attempted to 'prove' that differences between the various editions of the AV1611 were significant. Table A14 shows that they are not.

Table A15

LORD, GOD, *JHVH* and Lord, *Adonai* in AV1611 versus NASV, NKJV

Verse	LORD, <i>JHVH</i>	Lord, <i>Adonai</i>	lord, lords
Genesis 18:3		AV1611, NKJV	NASV
Genesis 19:18		AV1611	NASV, NKJV
Exodus 15:17b	NASV, NKJV	AV1611	
Exodus 33:9 <sup>Note 4</sup>	NASV, NKJV		
Exodus 34:9 <sup>Note 5</sup>	AV1611, NASV	NKJV	
Numbers 14:17	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Judges 6:13 <sup>Note 6</sup>		AV1611	NASV, NKJV
2 Samuel 7:22	AV1611	NASV, NKJV	
1 Kings 3:10	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
2 Kings 7:6	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Psalms 2:4	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Psalms 40:17	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Psalms 51:15	NASV	AV1611, NKJV	
Psalms 68:26	NASV	AV1611, NKJV	
Isaiah 4:4	NASV	AV1611, NKJV	
Isaiah 9:8	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Isaiah 9:17	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Isaiah 10:12	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Isaiah 11:11	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Isaiah 21:8		NASV, NKJV	AV1611
Isaiah 21:16	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Isaiah 29:13	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	
Isaiah 38:16	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	

Verse	LORD, <i>JHVH</i>	Lord, <i>Adonai</i>	lord, lords
Amos 3:7	NASV	AV1611, NKJV	
Amos 7:8	NASV	AV1611, NKJV	
Zechariah 9:4	NKJV	AV1611, NASV	

## Notes:

1. The versions cited are those listed in **References**.
2. Young's *Concordance* and Green's *Interlinear* have been used to locate and check the verses listed in **Table A15**.
3. Different editions of the NASV, NKJV may read differently in the verses cited.
4. The term JHVH, Jehovah, is absent from the Masoretic Hebrew Text. The AV1611 therefore correctly reads "*the LORD*" in italics. The NASV, NKJV do not.
5. The AV1611, NASV correctly have JHVH as "*GOD.*" The NKJV incorrectly attaches JHVH as "*LORD*" to "*God of Israel.*"
6. The NASV, NKJV have "*Lord*" in verse 15, where the NASV switches from "*him*" to "*Him.*"
7. Of the 26 verses listed, the NASV and NKJV are incorrect in 12 and 20 verses respectively, jointly reading incorrectly in 6 verses.
8. In sum, the AV1611 is correct in all readings and is the only bible that can be trusted to draw the correct distinction between **LORD, *JHVH*** and **Lord, *Adonai***.

Table A16

**AV1611 Readings Supported by Gothic pre-AD 350 and/or Early English Bibles,  
Distorted, Doubted or Omitted by NASV and/or NIV from *In Awe of Thy Word*, by  
Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger**

W, T, G, B's: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops'

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
Matt. 1:25	<b>firstborn</b>	717	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	157, 159, 216-218
Matt. 5:22	<b>without a cause</b>	638	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Matt. 5:44	<b>bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you...despitefully use you</b>	642	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Matt. 6:1	<b>alms</b>	813	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	n.a.
Matt. 6:13b	<b>For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen</b>	817	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	252-3
Matt. 6:33	<b>of God</b>	712	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Matt. 8:29	<b>Jesus</b>	635, 657	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	157, 253-4
Matt. 9:32 etc.	<b>devil</b>	723	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.



<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
Matt. 11:23, Luke 10:15 etc.	<b>hell</b>	668	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	137-8
Matt. 12:31	<b>Holy</b>	740	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, T, G, B's	n.a.
Matt. 17:21	<b>Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting</b>	724	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	155, 189
Matt. 18:11	<b>For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost</b>	718	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	155, 189
Matt. 19:17	<b>that is, God</b>	714	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	254
Matt. 23:23	<b>faith</b>	720	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Matt. 25:21	<b>lord</b>	734		n.a.
Matt. 28:20, Mark 10:30, Luke 1:70 etc.	<b>world</b>	736-7	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	135-6
Mark 6:11b	<b>Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city</b>	804	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	158

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
Mark 7:16	<b>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear</b>	671	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	155, 189
Mark 9:29	<b>and fasting</b>	670	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	155
Mark 9:42	<b>in me</b> (NASV omits)	658	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Mark 9:44, 46	<b>Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched</b>	667	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	155
Mark 10:21	<b>take up the cross</b>	812	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	158-162, 166
Mark 10:24	<b>for them that trust in riches</b>	660	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	168-9
Mark 10:52	<b>Jesus</b> (NASV Him)	806	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	45, 195
Mark 12:32	<b>God</b> (NASV He)	713	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Mark 13:33	<b>watch and pray</b>	728	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
Mark 15:28	<b>And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors</b>	665	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 2:33	<b>Joseph</b>	638	Gothic pre-AD 350	216-218
Luke 2:40	<b>waxed...in spirit</b>	652	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 4:4	<b>but by every word of God</b>	650	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 4:25 etc.	<b>heaven</b>	669	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 9:35	<b>beloved</b>	656	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	163
Luke 9:55-56	<b>and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them</b>	662	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
Luke 11:2, 4	<b>Our, which art in heaven, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth, but deliver us from evil</b>	726	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	252-3
Luke 11:54	<b>that they might accuse him</b>	722	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 16:23	<b>in hell...lift</b>	647	Gothic pre-AD 350	137 (Luke 16:19-31)
Luke 17:36	<b>Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left</b>	741	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, G, B's	68, 77, 154-5
Luke 23:17	<b>For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast</b>	731	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	155
Luke 22:64	<b>they struck him on the face</b>	732	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 22:68	<b>nor let me go</b>	733	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 23:42	<b>And he said unto Jesus, Lord</b>	734	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Luke 24:36	<b>Jesus</b> (NASV alters to He)	735	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	45, 195
John 1:14	<b>only begotten</b> (NIV has One and Only)	715	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	198

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
John 1:18	<b>only begotten Son</b>	716	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	107, 197-200, 258-260
John 3:13	<b>which is in heaven</b>	739	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	260-1
John 3:36	<b>believeth not</b> (NASV does not obey)	719	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	132-3
John 5:4	<b>For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had</b>	729	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	50, 156
John 6:47	<b>on me</b>	659	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	170-2, 261-2
John 6:69	<b>that Christ, the Son of the living</b>	654	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
John 7:39	<b>Holy</b>	808	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	n.a.
John 9:4	<b>I</b>	661	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
John 10:21	<b>words</b>	651	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
John 10:32	<b>my</b>	653	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
John 16:16	<b>because I go to the Father</b>	664	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
John 17:11	<b>those</b>	666	Gothic pre-AD 350, Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
Rom. 8:1	<b>who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit</b>	646	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Rom. 9:28	<b>in righteousness</b>	639	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Rom. 14:10	<b>Christ</b>	631	Gothic pre-AD 350	175, 213
Rom. 16:24	<b>The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.</b>	630	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
1 Cor. 5:4	<b>Christ, Christ</b>	632	Gothic pre-AD 350	46, 195
1 Cor. 5:5	<b>Jesus</b>	635	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
1 Cor. 5:7b	<b>for us</b>	640	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
1 Cor. 7:5	<b>fasting and</b>	816	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	n.a.
1 Cor. 9:1	<b>Christ</b>	633	Gothic pre-AD 350	45, 195
1 Cor. 11:24	<b>broken</b>	639	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
1 Cor. 15:47	<b>the Lord</b>	636	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
1 Cor. 16:22	<b>Jesus Christ</b>	629	Gothic pre-AD 350	45, 195
2 Cor. 6:5	<b>in watchings, in fastings</b>	814	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	n.a.
2 Cor. 10:4	<b>mighty through God</b>	644	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
2 Cor. 11:27	<b>in fastings</b>	815	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B's	n.a.
Gal. 1:3	<b>our</b>	807	Gothic pre-AD 350, T, G, B'	n.a.
Gal. 4:7	<b>through Christ</b>	634	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Gal. 6:17	<b>in, the Lord</b>	637	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Eph. 2:1	<b>hath he quickened</b>	641	Gothic pre-AD 350	135
Eph. 3:14	<b>of our Lord Jesus Christ</b>	629	Gothic pre-AD 350	265
Eph. 4:6	<b>you</b>	643	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.

<b>Verse</b>	<b>AV1611 Reading</b>	<b>Page, <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i></b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Page, <i>KJO Controversy</i></b>
Eph. 5:5	<b>whoremonger</b>	646	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Phil. 4:13	<b>Christ</b>	631	Gothic pre-AD 350	266
Col. 2:11	<b>of the sins</b>	640	Gothic pre-AD 350	181
Col. 2:18	<b>not</b>	645	Gothic pre-AD 350	181-2, 266
Col. 2:23	<b>neglecting of the body</b>	645	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Col. 3:6	<b>on the children of disobedience</b>	648	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
Col. 3:22	<b>singleness</b>	644	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
1 Thess. 3:13	<b>God, even our Father</b>	634	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
2 Thess. 1:2	<b>our</b>	727	Anglo-Saxon pre-AD 700, W, T, G, B's	n.a.
2 Thess. 1:8	<b>Christ</b>	633	Gothic pre-AD 350	46, 195
2 Thess. 1:12	<b>Christ</b>	632	Gothic pre-AD 350	46, 195
1 Tim. 2:7	<b>in Christ</b>	630	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.
2 Tim. 4:1	<b>the Lord</b>	637	Gothic pre-AD 350	n.a.



**Appendix References**

1. *Holy Bible*, AV1611, Cambridge University Press, Cameo Edition
2. *Rheims New Testament (1582)*, JR, [www.hti.umich.edu/r/rheims/browse.html](http://www.hti.umich.edu/r/rheims/browse.html)
3. *Douay Rheims Version*, 1749 Challoner Revision, Tan Books and Publishers, 1971
4. *Revised Version*, RV, Cambridge University Press
5. *Jerusalem Bible*, JB, Dartman, Longman & Todd, 1968
6. *NIV*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1978, [www.21cent.net/cf/cf-frame-nivonline.htm](http://www.21cent.net/cf/cf-frame-nivonline.htm)
7. *New World Translation*, NWT, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1984, [www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm](http://www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm)
8. *NRSV*, [www.devotions.net/bible/00bible.htm](http://www.devotions.net/bible/00bible.htm)
9. *NASV*, The Lockman Foundation, Holman Bible Publishers, 1977
10. *NKJV*, British Usage Edition, Samuel Bagster & Sons, Thomas Nelson Inc., 1982
11. *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible*, Robert Young, Lutterworth Press, 1973
12. *The Interlinear Bible [Masoretic] Hebrew English*, Jay P. Green Sr., Baker Book House Company, 1983

---

## References

Readers of the 1<sup>st</sup> Edition of this work, available from A. V. Publications as a CD, should note that the [www.geocities.com/brandplucked/](http://www.geocities.com/brandplucked/) address no longer applies. Will Kinney's articles are now on [brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm) and [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/will-kinneys-articles-on-the-av-issue.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/will-kinneys-articles-on-the-av-issue.php). The references have been updated accordingly. It should also be noted that some sites referenced below are no longer available. This has been noted as necessary in dark blue next to the reference. Alternative sites have also been noted where known and/or beneficial, in dark blue

- <sup>1</sup> *The Scholarship Controversy, Can You Trust the Professional Liars?* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Believers Press, 1996
- <sup>2</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, September 1995-March 1996. The September and December 1995 issues carried the details of Dr Ruckman's response to White's challenge
- <sup>3</sup> *The King James Only Controversy, Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* by James R. White, Bethany House Publishers, 1995
- <sup>4</sup> [www.biblebelievers.com/Holland1.html](http://www.biblebelievers.com/Holland1.html), Thomas Holland
- <sup>5</sup> [av1611.com/kjbp/articles.html](http://av1611.com/kjbp/articles.html), Will Kinney, [av1611.com/kjbp/articles/whitney-kjoc.html](http://av1611.com/kjbp/articles/whitney-kjoc.html), Tom Whitney
- <sup>6</sup> [www.wayoflife.org/fbns/examining01.htm](http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/examining01.htm), David Cloud. Page no longer available
- <sup>7</sup> [www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html](http://www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html), Gail Riplinger
- <sup>8</sup> "*O Biblios*" *The Book* by Alan O'Reilly, Covenant Books, 2005, now online, [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/). Note that the online A4 format has changed the page numbers
- <sup>9</sup> *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* B.F.T. #1825 by Jack A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1990
- <sup>10</sup> *Summary of the Traditional Text* by Rev D.A. Waite [www.deanburgonsociety.org/DeanBurgon/dbs2771.htm#III. %20Dean%20Burgon's](http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/DeanBurgon/dbs2771.htm#III.%20Dean%20Burgon's)
- <sup>11</sup> *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text – A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version* B.F.T. #1617 by Jack. A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1988
- <sup>12</sup> *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1984. See also [kjv.benabraham.com/html/our\\_authorized\\_bible\\_vindicate.html](http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicate.html)
- <sup>13</sup> *The Revision Revised* by Dean John William Burgon, A.G. Hobbs Publications, 1983
- <sup>14</sup> *New Age Versions* by G.A. Riplinger, Bible and Literature Missionary Foundation, 1993
- <sup>15</sup> *Babylon Mystery Religion* by Ralph Woodrow, Ralph Woodrow Evangelistic Association, Inc., 1981. Note that Ralph Woodrow has since denied the contents of this book. However, the material has essentially been substantiated by David W. Daniels in his book *Babylon Religion* available from Chick Publications, [www.chick.com/catalog/catholicism.asp](http://www.chick.com/catalog/catholicism.asp)
- <sup>16</sup> *Pastoral Epistles, I and II Timothy – Titus* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1989
- <sup>17</sup> *The Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1973
- <sup>18</sup> *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970
- <sup>19</sup> *God Only Wrote One Bible* by Jasper James Ray, The Eye-Opener Publishers, 1980
- <sup>20</sup> *New Eye Opener*, leaflet by Jasper James Ray
- <sup>21</sup> [www.devotions.net/bible/00bible.htm](http://www.devotions.net/bible/00bible.htm)
- <sup>22</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, May 1993
- <sup>23</sup> *Defending the King James Bible* by Donald Waite, The Bible for Today, 1992
- <sup>24</sup> *The Islamic Invasion* by Robert Morey, Harvest House Publishers, 1992

- 
- <sup>25</sup> *The Men Behind the KJV* by Gustavus S. Paine, Baker Book House, 1982
- <sup>26</sup> *The Translators to the Reader* by Dr Miles Smith, [www.ccel.org/bible/kjv/preface/pref1.htm](http://www.ccel.org/bible/kjv/preface/pref1.htm), [www.piney.com/DocKJVPref1611.html](http://www.piney.com/DocKJVPref1611.html). See also [www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm](http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm)
- <sup>27</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, February 2003, June 2006
- <sup>28</sup> *New King James Version*, Preface, p vii, Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1982
- <sup>29</sup> [www.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~cslui/myway.html](http://www.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~cslui/myway.html)
- <sup>30</sup> *The Collapse of Evolution* by Scott M. Huse, Baker Book House, 1983
- <sup>31</sup> *The Answer Book* by Dr Samuel C. Gipp, Samuel C. Gipp, 1989
- <sup>32</sup> *The Godfathers*, Chick Publications 1982, [www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0114.asp](http://www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0114.asp)
- <sup>33</sup> *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1988
- <sup>34</sup> IONA Project, [www.project-iona.co.uk/subcategory.php?ionasub\\_id=70](http://www.project-iona.co.uk/subcategory.php?ionasub_id=70). Page no longer available.
- <sup>35</sup> "Famine in the Land" by Norman Ward, Which Bible Society, Inc.
- <sup>36</sup> [www.aomin.org/index.php?catid=6&blogid=1](http://www.aomin.org/index.php?catid=6&blogid=1)
- <sup>37</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, August 2006
- <sup>38</sup> [www.exorthodoxforchrist.com/riplinger.htm](http://www.exorthodoxforchrist.com/riplinger.htm). Page no longer available.
- <sup>39</sup> *In Awe of Thy Word* by G.A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp., 2003
- <sup>40</sup> *The Book of the Minor Prophets, Vol. 1 Hosea-Nahum* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1978
- <sup>41</sup> *The Septuagint, with Apocrypha, Greek and English*, Brenton, Zondervan Reprint from Samuel Bagster, 1851
- <sup>42</sup> C.H. Spurgeon's FINAL MANIFESTO, April 1891
- <sup>43</sup> *Answers to Your Bible Version Questions* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, 2003
- <sup>44</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, May 1993
- <sup>45</sup> *The Oxford Bible Reader's Dictionary and Concordance*
- <sup>46</sup> *The Wycliffe New Testament 1388*, The British Library, 2002. Old Testament references are taken from [www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/) The Wycliffe Bible, 1395
- <sup>47</sup> *The Newe Testament by William Tyndale, translator, 1526*, The Martyr's Bible Series, Volume 1, 1989
- <sup>48</sup> *The Newe Testament of the Matthew's Bible 1537 AD*, The Martyr's Bible Series, Volume , 1989
- <sup>49</sup> *The Geneva Bible, 1599*, L.L. Brown Publishing, 1995
- <sup>50</sup> *The Crisis*, Chick Publications, [www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0026/0026\\_01.asp](http://www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0026/0026_01.asp)
- <sup>51</sup> *The Papal Visit weighed and found wanting*, J.E. North, Focus Publications, Sussex, 1982
- <sup>52</sup> *All Roads Lead to Rome?* by Michael de Semlyen, Dorchester House Publications, 1991
- <sup>53</sup> [news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/3007568.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/3007568.stm), Bishop Jeffrey John of Reading
- <sup>54</sup> [www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,11069-2245849,00.html](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,11069-2245849,00.html), Bishop of Nevada, Katharine Jefferts Schori. Search for Bishop of Nevada, Katharine Jefferts Schori to get the leader of the article.
- <sup>55</sup> *Crowned with Glory* by Dr Thomas Holland, Writer's Club Press, 2000. See Dr Holland's new site address, [www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb](http://www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb)
- <sup>56</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, March 1997
- <sup>57</sup> *Custer's Last Stand* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1981
- <sup>58</sup> *The True St George*, article by this author, who is happy to forward e-copies to anyone interested

- 
- <sup>59</sup> *Gipp's Understandable History of the Bible* by Dr Samuel C. Gipp, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Day Star, 2004
- <sup>60</sup> *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament* by Everett W. Fowler, Maranatha Bible Press, 1981
- <sup>61</sup> *If The Foundations be Destroyed* by Chick Salliby, Word and Prayer Ministries, 1994
- <sup>62</sup> *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, Stephens's 1550 Edition*, edited by George Ricker Berry, Eye Opener Publishers, first published, 1897
- <sup>63</sup> *A Brief History of English Bible Translations* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1993, [www.av1611.org/kjv/kjvhist.html](http://www.av1611.org/kjv/kjvhist.html)
- <sup>64</sup> *Counterfeit or Genuine Mark 16 John 8* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1984. See also [www.ccel.org/ccel/burgon/mark.html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/burgon/mark.html)
- <sup>65</sup> *The King James Version Defended* by Edward F. Hills, The Christian Research Press, 1973
- <sup>66</sup> *The Pool of Bethesda*, The Trinitarian Bible Society, Article 51
- <sup>67</sup> *The Language of the King James Bible* by G.A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp., 1998
- <sup>68</sup> *The Answer Book* by Dr Samuel Gipp, Bible and Literature Missionary Foundation, 1989
- <sup>69</sup> [www.puritanboard.com/showthread.php?t=16705](http://www.puritanboard.com/showthread.php?t=16705). The current link is [www.puritanboard.com/f63/merits-v-16705/](http://www.puritanboard.com/f63/merits-v-16705/)
- <sup>70</sup> *Expository Dictionary of Bible Words* edited by W.E. Vine, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Basingstoke, Hants. 1981
- <sup>71</sup> *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible* edited by Robert Young, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, Lutterworth Press, London 1973
- <sup>72</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, February 2002, August 2002
- <sup>73</sup> *The Presbyterian Review*, 1881, Vol. 2, No. 6, [scdc.library.ptsem.edu/mets/mets.aspx?src=BR188126&div=1&img=14](http://scdc.library.ptsem.edu/mets/mets.aspx?src=BR188126&div=1&img=14)
- <sup>74</sup> *One Book Stands Alone* by Dr Douglas D. Stauffer, McCowen Mills Publishers, 2001
- <sup>75</sup> [www.1john57.com/1john57.htm](http://www.1john57.com/1john57.htm)
- <sup>76</sup> *The Corruption of the Word: The Failure of Modern New Testament Scholarship* by Kevin James, Micro-Load Press, 1990.
- <sup>77</sup> *True or False?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1983
- <sup>78</sup> [members.aol.com/basfawlt/luke2\\_14.htm](http://members.aol.com/basfawlt/luke2_14.htm). Page no longer available
- <sup>79</sup> [members.aol.com/kjvisbest/parody\\_intro.htm](http://members.aol.com/kjvisbest/parody_intro.htm). Page no longer available
- <sup>80</sup> *The Edge of the Sword* by General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley, Star, 1981
- <sup>81</sup> [news.independent.co.uk/people/obituaries/article351548.ece](http://news.independent.co.uk/people/obituaries/article351548.ece)
- <sup>82</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/acts957hear720excee.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/acts957hear720excee.htm)
- <sup>83</sup> [www.sharperiron.org/2006/08/21/acts-1920-a-test-case-for-translation-evaluation/](http://www.sharperiron.org/2006/08/21/acts-1920-a-test-case-for-translation-evaluation/)
- <sup>84</sup> [www.kjvonly.org/doug/index\\_doug.html](http://www.kjvonly.org/doug/index_doug.html)
- <sup>85</sup> [www.kjv1611.org.uk/index.htm](http://www.kjv1611.org.uk/index.htm) . See list of articles
- <sup>86</sup> [www.scionofzion.com/olv.htm](http://www.scionofzion.com/olv.htm)
- <sup>87</sup> [www.kjvonly.org/bookstore.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/bookstore.htm)
- <sup>88</sup> *The Book of Acts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1974
- <sup>89</sup> [www.biblefortoday.org/Articles/reply.htm](http://www.biblefortoday.org/Articles/reply.htm)
- <sup>90</sup> *Should We Trust the New International Version?* FOCUS Christian Ministries Trust
- <sup>91</sup> *Are Roman Catholics Christians?* Chick Publications, 1985, [www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0071/0071\\_01.asp](http://www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0071/0071_01.asp)

- 
- <sup>92</sup> *Heresies of Westcott and Hort #595* by Rev D.A. Waite, B.F.T., 1978
- <sup>93</sup> *The Attack* Chick Publications, 1985, [www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0031/0031\\_01.asp](http://www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0031/0031_01.asp)
- <sup>94</sup> *Vigilance A Defence of British Liberty* by Ashley Mote, Tanner Publishing, 2001
- <sup>95</sup> *The History of Protestantism Part 2* by Rev J.A. Wylie, Mourne Missionary Trust
- <sup>96</sup> *Which Bible is God's Word?* by Gail Riplinger, Hearthstone Publishing, 1994, AV Publications, 2007
- <sup>97</sup> *Which Version: Does it Really Matter?* Quarterly Record, Issue Number: 577 – October to December 2006
- <sup>98</sup> *Final Authority* by Dr William P. Grady, Grady Publications, 1993
- <sup>99</sup> *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, Cassell, London, 1971
- <sup>100</sup> *A Pictorial History of Our English Bible* by David Beale, Bob Jones University Press, 1982
- <sup>101</sup> *The Book of Revelation* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970
- <sup>102</sup> *Differences in the King James Version Editions* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1963
- <sup>103</sup> *New International Version* by G.W. and D.E. Anderson, The Trinitarian Bible Society
- <sup>104</sup> [www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/q13.pdf](http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/q13.pdf)
- <sup>105</sup> [www.av1611.org/kjv/logsdon.html](http://www.av1611.org/kjv/logsdon.html)
- <sup>106</sup> *Fox's Book of Martyrs* edited by William Byron Forbush, Zondervan, 1967
- <sup>107</sup> *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples, Volume II* by Winston S. Churchill, Cassell & Co. Ltd, 1956, 1977
- <sup>108</sup> [www.ibs.org/niv/mct/NIV\\_MCT.pdf](http://www.ibs.org/niv/mct/NIV_MCT.pdf)
- <sup>109</sup> *The Truth about the King James Version Controversy* by Stewart Custer, Bob Jones University Press, 1981
- <sup>110</sup> *Believing Bible Study* by Edward F. Hills, The Christian Research Press, 1977
- <sup>111</sup> [www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/scripture-use.pdf](http://www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/scripture-use.pdf). Page no longer available
- <sup>112</sup> *About The "New" King James Bible* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1983
- <sup>113</sup> *The Books of First and Second Thessalonians and Philemon* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2005
- <sup>114</sup> *The Riplinger Report*, Issue No. 2
- <sup>115</sup> [www.kjv1611.org/aboutusdrruckman.html](http://www.kjv1611.org/aboutusdrruckman.html)
- <sup>116</sup> *Halley's Bible Handbook*, Zondervan, 1965
- <sup>117</sup> [www.stpaulskingsville.org/reformation.htm](http://www.stpaulskingsville.org/reformation.htm)
- <sup>118</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, May 1999, April 2002, September 2003
- <sup>119</sup> *The Book of Romans* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2003
- <sup>120</sup> *The Sure Word of Prophecy* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1969
- <sup>121</sup> *The Book of Matthew* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970
- <sup>122</sup> *The Books of the General Epistles Volume 2* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2004
- <sup>123</sup> *Mark of the Beast* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1969
- <sup>124</sup> *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1996
- <sup>125</sup> *The Book of Hebrews* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1996
- <sup>126</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/acts1011isa1910fish.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/acts1011isa1910fish.htm)

- 
- <sup>127</sup> [www.21cent.net/cf/cf-frame-nivonline.htm](http://www.21cent.net/cf/cf-frame-nivonline.htm). Page no longer available. See [rock-hay.tripod.com/worship/translat.htm](http://rock-hay.tripod.com/worship/translat.htm), [www.studylight.org/desk/](http://www.studylight.org/desk/) and follow links and [biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/](http://biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/) for the 2011 NIV
- <sup>128</sup> *The Bible Babel* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1981
- <sup>129</sup> *The Identity of the New Testament Text* by Wilbur N. Pickering, Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980, B.F.T. # 556
- <sup>130</sup> *Early Church Fathers and the Authorized Version, A Demonstration!* B.F.T. #2136 by Jack A. Moorman, The Bible for Today
- <sup>131</sup> [www.ccel.org/ccel/burton/corruption.toc.html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/burton/corruption.toc.html)
- <sup>132</sup> *The Force* by Chick Publications, [www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0115.asp](http://www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0115.asp)
- <sup>133</sup> [www.ccel.org/ccel/burton/mark.html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/burton/mark.html)
- <sup>134</sup> See Dr Holland's new site address, [www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb](http://www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb), Dr Thomas Holland's Manuscript Evidence Class, Lesson 6
- <sup>135</sup> [av1611.com/kjbp/articles/young-examination1.html](http://av1611.com/kjbp/articles/young-examination1.html)
- <sup>136</sup> *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* edited by E. A. Livingstone, Oxford University Press, 1987
- <sup>137</sup> *The Mythological Septuagint* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1996
- <sup>138</sup> [www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/) The Bishops' Bible, 1568
- <sup>139</sup> *Pope, Other Christians Not True Churches* by Nicole Winfield, International News, Comcast.net.html
- <sup>140</sup> [www.archive.org/details/traditionaltext00burgrich](http://www.archive.org/details/traditionaltext00burgrich)
- <sup>141</sup> *Satan's Masterpiece! The New ASV* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1972
- <sup>142</sup> [www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/) The Latin Vulgate, 425
- <sup>143</sup> *The Books of First and Second Corinthians* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2002
- <sup>144</sup> *The Books of the General Epistles Volume 1* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2005
- <sup>145</sup> *How to Teach the Original Greek* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1992
- <sup>146</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/john118begottenson.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/john118begottenson.htm)
- <sup>147</sup> *An Examination of the New King James Version, Part 1* by A. Hembd, TBS Quarterly Record, Issue Number: 581 – October to December 2007.
- <sup>148</sup> [www.experiencefestival.com/a/Bythos/id/199442](http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Bythos/id/199442)
- <sup>149</sup> *Let's Weigh The Evidence* by Barry Burton, Chick Publications, 1983
- <sup>150</sup> [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Granville\\_Sharp](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Granville_Sharp)
- <sup>151</sup> [chi.gospelcom.net/DAILYF/2001/11/daily-11-10-2001.shtml](http://chi.gospelcom.net/DAILYF/2001/11/daily-11-10-2001.shtml). Page no longer available
- <sup>152</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/deityofchrist3verses.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/deityofchrist3verses.htm)
- <sup>153</sup> [www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb](http://www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb), Dr Thomas Holland's Manuscript Evidence Class, Lesson 12
- <sup>154</sup> [www.blessedquietness.com/journal/housechu/john-14anddeity.htm](http://www.blessedquietness.com/journal/housechu/john-14anddeity.htm)
- <sup>155</sup> [www.studylight.org/desk/](http://www.studylight.org/desk/) The American Standard Version, 1901
- <sup>156</sup> *New King James Omissions* by G.A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp., leaflet
- <sup>157</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/colossians.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/colossians.htm)
- <sup>158</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/jameswhitejude4.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/jameswhitejude4.htm)
- <sup>159</sup> [www.greeknewtestament.com/B42C010.htm#V22](http://www.greeknewtestament.com/B42C010.htm#V22)
- <sup>160</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/phil2notrobbery.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/phil2notrobbery.htm)

- 
- <sup>161</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/micah52heb211origin.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/micah52heb211origin.htm)
- <sup>162</sup> *The NIV Reconsidered* by Earl Radmacher and Zane C. Hodges, Kerugma Inc., 1990
- <sup>163</sup> *The Antichrist Bible, The Revised English Bible* by Ian R.K. Paisley, Martyrs Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, 1989
- <sup>164</sup> [www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb](http://www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb), Dr Thomas Holland's Manuscript Evidence Class, Lesson 11
- <sup>165</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/turtleobservedpineth.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/turtleobservedpineth.htm)
- <sup>166</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/1corandcatholicbibl.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/1corandcatholicbibl.htm)
- <sup>167</sup> [www.studylight.org/desk/](http://www.studylight.org/desk/) Coverdale's Bible, 1535
- <sup>168</sup> *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, Loizeaux Brothers, 1959, first published in 1858
- <sup>169</sup> *Oxford Bible Atlas*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Oxford University Press, 1985
- <sup>170</sup> *The New KJV versus the KJV 1611 AD*, tract
- <sup>171</sup> *Problem Texts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, 1980
- <sup>172</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/acts957hear720excee.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/acts957hear720excee.htm)
- <sup>173</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/acts192eph113.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/acts192eph113.htm)
- <sup>174</sup> *The Book of Bible Problems* by Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D., 1997, Association for Biblical astronomy, 4527 Wetzel Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44109, USA
- <sup>175</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/rom76foreiglangen5020.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/rom76foreiglangen5020.htm)
- <sup>176</sup> [www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0118.asp?wpc=0118.asp&wpp=a](http://www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0118.asp?wpc=0118.asp&wpp=a)
- <sup>177</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/castinteethoathsake.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/castinteethoathsake.htm)
- <sup>178</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/godsavetheking.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/godsavetheking.htm)
- <sup>179</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/godforbid.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/godforbid.htm)
- <sup>180</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/thespirititself.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/thespirititself.htm)
- <sup>181</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/amos441sam5emerods.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/amos441sam5emerods.htm)
- <sup>182</sup> *The Book of Exodus* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1976
- <sup>183</sup> *Conies, Brass and Easter* by Rev. J.A. Moorman, B.F.T. #1737 The Bible for Today
- <sup>184</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/easterreplenish.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/easterreplenish.htm)
- <sup>185</sup> *Bible Believers' Bulletin*, April 1990, *The King's English*
- <sup>186</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/acts28131tim54.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/acts28131tim54.htm)
- <sup>187</sup> *The Book of Genesis* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1969
- <sup>188</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/acts1011isa1910fish.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/acts1011isa1910fish.htm)
- <sup>189</sup> [shakespeare.mit.edu/3henryvi/full.html](http://shakespeare.mit.edu/3henryvi/full.html)
- <sup>190</sup> *The Book of Job* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1978
- <sup>191</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/neeshaberleasing.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/neeshaberleasing.htm)
- <sup>192</sup> *Volume 1 of the Book of Psalms* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1992
- <sup>193</sup> *Why Psalm 12:6, 7 IS A promise Of The Infallible Preservation Of Scripture* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1992.
- <sup>194</sup> *Cum Privilegio* TBS Quarterly Record, July-September 1971 No. 436
- <sup>195</sup> *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, 2005
- <sup>196</sup> [www.jesus-is-lord.com/woudstra.htm](http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/woudstra.htm)

- 
- <sup>197</sup> [www.wayoflife.org/fbns/twohomosexuals.htm](http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/twohomosexuals.htm). Page no longer available. However, see [www.scionofzion.com/nivx.htm](http://www.scionofzion.com/nivx.htm) and [oneinmessiah.net/virgM.htm](http://oneinmessiah.net/virgM.htm)
- <sup>198</sup> *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume 1* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982
- <sup>199</sup> *Operation World – A Handbook for World Intercession* by P.G. Johnstone, STL Publications, 1978
- <sup>200</sup> *Human Nature in the Bible* by William Lyon Phelps, 1922, *Introduction*
- <sup>201</sup> *Monarchy* Channel 4 documentary
- <sup>202</sup> [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H. L. Mencken](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H._L._Mencken)
- <sup>203</sup> *Bible Believers' Bulletin*, November 1998, *Why God Dumped the Greek for the English*
- <sup>204</sup> *Stalingrad* by Heinz Schroter, Pan 1960
- <sup>205</sup> *Seven Baptisms* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore
- <sup>206</sup> *Tongues, Signs and Healing* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore
- <sup>207</sup> *The Book of John* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2005
- <sup>208</sup> *The Other Side of Calvinism* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1991
- <sup>209</sup> [kjb.benabraham.com/html/answers\\_to\\_objections\\_to\\_kjb\\_b.html](http://kjb.benabraham.com/html/answers_to_objections_to_kjb_b.html)
- <sup>210</sup> [brandplucked.webs.com/oldlatinkjb.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/oldlatinkjb.htm)
- <sup>211</sup> [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex\\_Alexandrinus](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_Alexandrinus)
- <sup>212</sup> [www.newadvent.org/cathen/04080c.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04080c.htm)
- <sup>213</sup> *The Translators Revived* by Alexander McClure, from the 1858 Edition, Maranatha Bible Society
- <sup>214</sup> *King James His Bible And Its Translators* by Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications
- <sup>215</sup> *Oliver Cromwell* by Sir Charles Firth, Oxford University Press, 1961
- <sup>216</sup> *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples, Volume II* by Winston S. Churchill, Cassell & Company Limited, 1977
- <sup>217</sup> *Jesuit Plots from Elizabethan to Modern* [1930s] *Times* by Albert Close, Protestant Truth Society, London
- <sup>218</sup> [www.ccel.org/s/schaff/encyc/encyc02/htm/iv.v.lxix.htm](http://www.ccel.org/s/schaff/encyc/encyc02/htm/iv.v.lxix.htm)
- <sup>219</sup> [www.bible-researcher.com/tyndale5.html](http://www.bible-researcher.com/tyndale5.html)
- <sup>220</sup> [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint\\_Catherine's\\_Monastery,\\_Mount\\_Sinai](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint_Catherine's_Monastery,_Mount_Sinai)
- <sup>221</sup> [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastern\\_Orthodox\\_Church](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastern_Orthodox_Church)
- <sup>222</sup> [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East-West\\_Schism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East-West_Schism)
- <sup>223</sup> *Christianity Through the Centuries* by Earle E. Cairns, Academie Books, 1981
- <sup>224</sup> *The History of the Christian Church*, edited by Dr Tim Dowley, Lion Publishing, 1977
- <sup>225</sup> *History of the Church of God* by Cushing Biggs Hassell, 1886, available from [www.pbministries.org/History/S.%20Hassell/church\\_of\\_god.htm](http://www.pbministries.org/History/S.%20Hassell/church_of_god.htm)
- <sup>226</sup> *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume 2* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1984
- <sup>227</sup> *Five Heresies Examined* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982
- <sup>228</sup> [www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek\\_waldensian.htm](http://www.kjvonly.org/doug/kutilek_waldensian.htm)
- <sup>229</sup> *Forever Settled, A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, B.F.T. #1428 by Jack A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1985, [www.biblebelievers.net/BibleVersions/kjcfors5.htm#XXVI](http://www.biblebelievers.net/BibleVersions/kjcfors5.htm#XXVI)
- <sup>230</sup> [www.champs-of-truth.com/reform/WLK\\_TRTR.PDF](http://www.champs-of-truth.com/reform/WLK_TRTR.PDF) p 241



---

<sup>231</sup> *The History of the Waldenses, Book Sixteenth of The History of Protestantism* by J.A. Wylie, Cassell & Company, Limited, reprinted 1985, Church History Research & Archives, Gallatin, Tennessee

<sup>232</sup> *The Romaunt Version of the Gospel According to John* by William Stephen Gilly, London 1848, CD from Sola Scriptura Publishing, Topeka, KS

<sup>233</sup> [members.aol.com/dwibclc/waldbib.htm](http://members.aol.com/dwibclc/waldbib.htm). Page no longer available